WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH OUR UNCLE SAM?

OR

BUILDING A CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

Class HN64

Book .M9

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

What's the Matter With Our Uncle Sam?

OR

Building a Christian Democracy

By

OTTO MUTZ

A Christian Democracy is a Republic that furnishes the means of educating its electorate, and the machinery through which that electorate can speak

1922
WOODRUFF PRESS
LINCOLN, NEBR.

HN64
.M9

Copyright 1922
OTTO MUTZ
Lincoln, Nebr.

PRICE:

Cloth Bound,	-	**$1.50**
Paper Bound,	- -	**1.00**

Sent Postpaid to any Address

APR 21 1922
©CL.A659708
no 1

CONTENTS

Chapter I
Introduction 1

Chapter II
What is Life? 12

Chapter III
The Blight of War 20

Chapter IV
A World Peace 37

Chapter V
The Nation's Dance of Death 45

Chapter VI
Government by Party 78

Chapter VII
Competition 101

Chapter VIII
Arbitration 117

Chapter IX
Industrial Peace 137

Chapter X
The Peril of American Cities 163

Chapter XI
The Problem of Over-Riches 178

Chapter XII
To the Christian Churches of America 199

Chapter XIII
To the Newly Enfranchised Women of America 212

Chapter XIV
When a Nation Speaks 228

VICTOR HUGO once said, "There is only one thing that is mightier than armies, and that thing is an idea whose time has come." The world war, which shook the very foundations of the organized governments of earth, brought to the American mind one idea whose time had come, the idea that "No nation can live to itself."

The same doctrine is today being applied to individuals. No man can live alone.

One of the lessons of the great war has been the lesson that a distinct individualism cannot build and permanently maintain the rights of great peoples, and fulfil the promise of Life, Liberty, and Happiness which was the ideal of this republic.

The architect builds to a well-thought-out plan. The painter never dips his brush until, through his mental vision, he has seen the finished painting. Thus art and architecture have, through their example, made plain that perfection in government is possible only as it realizes the vision of its people, for a nation without an ideal is like a ship without a rudder, a sail, or a compass.

No period of history has witnessed such world-wide unrest as at this time is shaking the very foundations of organized human governments. The unrest is not an aftermath of war, for the whole world was a seething mass of unrest long before anyone had thought of a world war.

Let the world take note that happiness is not a cause of unrest. It never organized a commonweal army. It never organized a strike. It never hoisted the red flag of anarchy. It never agitated the people for political reform. These things have ever been the direct cause of unrest and discontent.

The ideal of America is Life, Liberty, and Happiness.

Must America permit it to be truthfully said that the finished product of a century and a half of our republic is discontent, strife, over-riches, pitiful poverty, and political brigandage that permits the exploitation of the labor of the nation without conscience?

Must we change that proud boast that "Ours is a government of the people, for the people and by the people," into an humble acknowledgment that instead we have built a government of party, for party, and by party?

The "idea" that Victor Hugo says is "Mightier than armies," is to be the central thought of this little book, and to bring, at least in some degree, the answer to the question, "What's the matter with our Uncle Sam?" is to be its mission.

Five things are fundamental to a reconstruction of this government upon a foundation that will insure its perpetuity, and realize its ideals of Life, Liberty, and Happiness.

First. The blight of war must be destroyed in the world. The spirit of militarism is the demand of organized greed. War has ever been its birthright, and battlefields have been its harvests. Partial disarmament is not a remedy. The world wants peace. World Peace is possible, but it must come through the awakened conscience of the governments of the earth. Complete disarmament and an enduring world peace must come, or the civilizations of the earth must perish.

Second. The over-riches of our nation is not in hormony with the spirit of American institutions. It is the direct product of special privilege. If the brand of labor is on the rich man's steer, by every righteous judgment of the world, the steer must be returned to its owner,

for God intended that a nation's wealth should be owned by those who created it. It must be returned through the mandate of a christian people, for this is the evolution of the doctrines of the Christ, applied to a real Christian civilization. It must be returned by law.

Third. Industrial peace. Is just as imperative a demand of the world today as disarmament and world peace. It is so broad in its influence, that it reaches into every country of the world. Its solution must effect every industry that is dependent upon the labor of the people. It is the most complex problem of the age. Its solution demands the deepest study, and the application of the purest and the broadest Christian spirit that has ever been given to the solution of any problem that has engrossed the American mind.

Fourth. Government by party has failed. The political "Pie Counter" is not a worthy incentive to political action. It drives the best men and women from political life. It is government by the least, instead of the most fit. It must be destroyed, and upon its ruins must be built a Christian Democracy that will ever be sensitive to the will of the people. Our Bicameral English system of law-making must be displaced by a Uni-cameral system in every state and in the nation and the last dregs of political misrepresentation in our legislative halls must be burned out of our political life by the fires of a real American Christian Democracy.

Fifth. The high cost of government is the Nation's "Dance of Death." Unjust taxation has become legal confiscation. Wealth has never borne its full share of the burdens of government. Personal responsibility assessment, and state registration for citizenship, will eliminate nearly every dollar of the expense of assessment, and completely and effectually prevent the tax

dodger from avoiding the payment of his full share of the state's taxes.

A Christian Democracy is the greatest challenge of America today. A government of the people, for the people, and by the people must be realized, or the nation must perish by its own hands. Such a Christian Democracy must rest upon, and have an abiding faith in the principles of majority rule. It must have the machinery for qualifying the people for intelligent action. It must furnish the machinery through which the government can function with the least possible delay. Every candidate for a seat in congress and for President and Vice President must be named in a national Presidential Primary, and the quadrennial disgrace of nominating candidates for the highest honors within our gift, must be cleansed of the taint of dishonor that winks at the spending of more money in such contests than would pay every salary of every executive officer in the nation for an entire quadrennium. The "Pie Counter" must be destroyed. That political lie called "The Merit System" must be made a realized fact in the American Government.

These are the ideals of a Christian Democracy that this nation must build when the dregs of unrighteousness of "Government By Party" shall have been burned out of the political life of this great Christian Republic.

This little book is respectfully dedicated to the Christian churches of America, to the newly enfranchised women, and to that great army of men and women whose lives under the handicaps of our industrial plutocracy give them no promise that in their old age they may own a home of their own, and no promise for the future of their children.

THE AUTHOR.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Every student of human affairs is confronted with the fact that man exists. We are here. We have a being. We are possessed with intelligence. Wherever we look we see the unmistakable evidences that the wonderful creation all about us is, in one way or another, adapted to the needs of man. We drink the water. We breathe the air. We cultivate the fields that they may bring forth the fruits of earth. We bask in the warm sunshine, and our hearts are lifted up in praise to God as we see the springing of new life all around us, invited and tempted by sunshine and shower.

In the heavens above us the sun reigns as the great king of the universe, and among the starry hosts of heaven rides the moon as the beautiful queen of the night. Her soft light sheds its benediction upon the world and guards its slumbers.

What is the meaning of all this wonderful creation? The philosophers of every age have attempted to answer this question, but every attempt has brought to the world new questions, new facts, new theories, and new definitions.

Is the question answered in Holy Writ? Holy Writ is the world's Bible, and the first four words of that immortal book are, "In the beginning God."

In that book we are told that it was God who created the heavens, in which He placed the sun, to give us light by day, and the moon, to give us light by night.

Out in the great illimitable space of God's creation

are countless millions of worlds, and suns, and stars, each traveling on through space with the precision of God's unchangeable laws. No conflict. No uncertainty. Man looks on in awe and wonder.

This wonderful message says that He created the earth with its wide flowing rivers, its majestic forests, its lordly mountains with their hidden wealth of minerals, their retorts of gas, and their forests of coal. He created a kingdom of animals, and a kingdom of vegetables, and then, after He had pronounced it all good, He said, "Let us create man in our own image."

Adam was the first man and Eve was the first woman who ever beheld the beauties of this world of God's great creation when He placed them in the Garden of Eden. In that Garden of Eden, fresh from the hand of God, and all unprofaned by the hand of man.

The first command that was ever given to man was the command given to Adam and Eve when God said, "Of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, for on the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Poor, weak, deluded Adam! Created in the image of God, and surrounded by everything that had been created for his comfort and happiness, in his weakness, he stamped upon the whole human family the desire to possess forbidden fruit.

God fixed the penalty for that first sin upon Adam, and through him upon the whole human family, when He said to Adam, "Out of the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground."

This penalty has never been removed. It stands today as it stood when the words were spoken. The words were not spoken to Adam alone, but to the teeming mil-

lions of his children who were destined to make up all the generations of men who should follow him. They were spoken to you and to me, as much as they were spoken to Adam. No man can escape that penalty. No excuse can remove the obligation. *The right to live is the duty to work.*

Wilful, stubborn, selfish man! Have you not in every generation tried to avoid the payment of that penalty? Have you not eaten the fruits of the labor of others? Have you not applied at the great storehouses of the world for the good things of life, and refused to earn them by the sweat of your face? Did you not establish among men the doctrine of "The divine right of kings?" Did not those kings compel the weaker member of society to pay tribute to their kingly powers? Have you not sent your armies of conquest to overcome the weaker nations of the earth, and held them in bondage to do the work that you should have done? In every generation have you not claimed rights that God intended you should claim only after you had paid the penalty of Adam's sin?

If these things are true, Oh Man! you must account for a broken law. God's laws are inexorable. His penalties are just. In His own good time He will call you to account. You cannot rightly claim your inheritance from God's great bounty until the condition, "Out of the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," is met.

A beautiful sunset was painting pictures upon the landscapes of Eden. Out in yonder valley was Cain, the firstborn child of earth, a tiller of the soil, and on yonder hills was Abel, a keeper of flocks, each bringing an offering to the Lord.

History fails to record how dispute arose between

them, but when Cain met Adam, and Abel came not, Adam said to Cain, "Where is thy brother Abel," Cain replied, "I do not know. Am I my brother's keeper?"

That question has come ringing down through all the ages to the present time. Am I my brother's keeper? Theologians in every generation have tried to answer it, but in the lives of men it has never been answered. Might won in the conflict, and from that day—that fateful day—might has ruled the world. Nation has met nation in open conquest, and to physical force the world has bowed in humble submission. Ages have come and gone. Nations have risen and decayed, but the sovereign power of the iron hand of autocracy has never been successfully disputed.

Two thousand years ago a babe was born in Bethlehem. Every year we celebrate his birthday. Two thousand years ago a man died on a cross. We are still observing that day and someone is asking, Why? I will tell you why. It is because of the beauty and the shining glory of his life, his deeds, his message, his death, and his triumph over death.

Four thousand years of human history had passed. The human family had groped in the darkness of despair all these years, but this man brought to the world a new philosophy of life. He taught the world the doctrine of the fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man. He taught it the doctrine of love and service.

Is someone saying that Christ came to the world to save it from sin? Not so. Christ did not come to save the world, but to teach the world that new philosophy of life, and to make it possible that the world might save itself.

The restless mind of man has ever looked out into the

unknown for the answer to the unsolved problems of the world. A vision troubled the heart of a noble son. The queen hearkened to his plea, and Columbus set sail out into the great unknown ocean toward the setting sun.

Does the world realize that its civilization has always moved toward the setting sun? Well, you know the story. Fifteen centuries of a Christian civilization had passed when Columbus planted upon the soil of a new world the seeds of a new civilization. On came the hosts from every land, bringing only one thought, one hope, one purpose, one creed, when the pendulum of the clock of Father Time swung back as the Pilgrim Fathers planted upon the soil of the new world that first principle of a real civilization, Religious Liberty.

"The breaking waves dashed high on a stern and rock bound coast,
And the woods against a stormy sky their giant branches tossed,
And the heavy night hung dark, the hills and the waters o'er,
When a band of exiles moored their bark on a wild New England shore.

Not as the conquerors came, they the true-hearted came,
Not with the roll of stirring drums, and trumps that seek of fame,
Not as the flying came, in silence and in fear,
They shook the depths of the desert gloom with their songs of lofty cheer.

Amidst the storm they sang, and the stars heard, and the sea,

And the sounding aisles of the dim wood rang to the
anthems of the free,
The ocean eagle soared from his nest on the wild wave's
foam,
And the rocking pines of the forest roared, this was
their welcome home.

What sought they thus afar, bright jewels of the mind?
The wealth of seas, the spoils of war? They sought a
faith's pure shrine;
Aye, call this Holy ground, the soil where first they
trod,
They've left unstained what here they brought, freedom
to worship God."

Those old Pilgrims indeed "sought a faith's pure shrine," but oppression was not to end here. A great ocean was not to be a barrier to kingly power. Liberty was not to be achieved without a struggle. The storm clouds that hovered over them, bound them into a closer union, for in the new world there were no animosities, no rank, no station, no wealth, no kings, and no classes.

But why tell the story that has so often been told? The cherished right of Religious Liberty had been planted upon Plymouth Rock, and those old patriots, looking into the future, caught a new vision. It was a vision of political equality. Time has told the story of political evolution, and with the coming of that new vision, the old clock was about to swing back to mark the dawn of that vision when—— Have you heard the story of Mount Sinai? Well, just as truly as the Ten Commandments were written on the tablets of stone by the finger of God, the finger of God guided the hand of

Thomas Jefferson when he wrote those immortal words, "All men are created equal, and endowed with certain *inalienable* rights. Among these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

No angels were there to sing the glad news to an anxious world. No messenger was sent to tell the story to the people, but a new doctrine of human rights had been born.

The doctrine of Human Rights and Religious Liberty meant to those old patriots the end of kings, and lords, and rank, and station, and it came to them as an inspiration direct from Heaven.

Upon that foundation this great republic was built with a vision of a world full of new hopes, new opportunities, new strength, new progress, and improved conditions for all.

This vision came to the world after nearly six thousand years of autocratic power, and now the old world was asking, "Can a republic live?" Is the right of kings divine?" "Will the laws made by the people be respected and obeyed?" and, "Can a people be made to understand and respect the principle of majority rule?"

No one will wonder at these questions, because, up to this time in human history, human rights had been little understood, and little considered. Autocracy had reigned supreme. The Old World had asked, "Can a republic live?" and there were none to answer from experience, for no republic had lived, but that great patriot, Alexander Hamilton, gave to America a new vision and to the world a new hope when he said to his compatriots, "It is ours to be the grave in which the hopes of the world shall be entombed, or the pillar of cloud that light us on to our millennial glory. Let us not forget our immortal trust."

More than two centuries have passed since those immortal words were spoken, since that immortal trust was laid upon America, and I ask, is there a red-blooded American, living under the folds of Old Glory, who is willing that America shall be the grave in which the hopes of the world shall be entombed? I know your answer, and I cry out with the earnestness of a patriotic fervor as I remind you that America is to be the last battle ground for the establishment of Human Rights and Human Liberty. Ours is a graver mission than we have ever assumed. Jefferson indeed wrote into the ethics of the world the right of Life, but this generation is asking the question, "What is Life?" He wrote into our institutions the right of Liberty, but the world is asking today, "What is Liberty?" And then he wrote as one of the inalienable rights of man, the right of the pursuit of Happiness, but the world wants to know today if the "Life" and the "Liberty" proclaimed as *inalienable* by Jefferson will secure to the people the promise of Happiness.

Does the world enjoy today the happiness promised by Jefferson when he wrote the Declaration?

Fellow Americans! The new conditions under which we live have brought to us new problems. These problems are more complex than America has ever faced. We are living in an electric age. The world is moving as it never moved before. The old car of commercial progress is outrunning our machinery for keeping pace with that progress. To America has indeed been given a sacred mission and an immortal trust. If we fail to keep that trust, the world has failed, for America is the last hope of the world.

On a beautiful day in June, I stood on the bank of

the great Niagara River. The peaceful waters where I stood gave no evidence of the dangers, as the rapids approached the falls below. Yonder in the distance I could see a little craft in which a company of thoughtless youth were basking in the delights of a row in the warm June sunshine. Down the river they were drifting in their care-free spirit of youth, until I could hear their happy voices in songs and peals of laughter. Suddenly a man came running as he frantically exclaimed in a loud voice, "Pull for the shore! The rapids are ahead! Danger! Danger! Danger!"

An excited crowd gathered as he continued to shout at the top of his voice, "The rapids are ahead," and "Pull for the shore," but the danger was not seen, and the call was unheeded as they drifted toward the great falls all thoughtless of the impending danger. As we stood looking, the rapids caught and swept them faster and faster. They saw the danger as the great crowd took up the cry of "Danger," and "Pull for the shore," and for the first time was heard that awful cry of distress and anguish, "Help!" "Help!" "Help!" Throw out the lifeline!" "Throw out the lifeline!" But it was too late. No man had a lifeline, and no man had the power to rescue that happy, thoughtless company from certain death. Faster and faster their little bark was borne on by the cruel rapids, while on the shore a thousand people witnessed their plunge over the awful precipice.

Thoughtless America, you are basking in the sunshine of youth. You have forgotten everything but the scenes around you. Born to a great mission in the world, in the exuberance of your youth you have lost the vision that was yours. You have forgotten the mission that was given you, and you have forgotten God.

The cry of danger is heard on every hand, but you will not heed it. The rapids are just ahead and for you it is not yet too late, but if you do not heed the cry, if you will not turn your face and listen to the cries of danger all about you, tomorrow you will be calling, "Throw out the lifeline!"

Young America, so full of promise, so full of opportunities, heed the cry before it is too late. You must not fail, for in this world's greatest conflict for the preservation of those rights so faithfully guaranteed to us by our patriotic forefathers you must lead the way. The contending forces in that great conflict are at this moment surging around the demands of organized greed. Organized selfishness has taken little account of Human Rights. It has thought only of selfish interests. The battle is on, and before the victory shall be won, the very foundations of this republic will tremble. This great conflict will never end, and the battle will never be won, until the rights of every human being under the jurisdiction of Old Glory shall be guaranteed by a real government of the people, for the people and by the people, and that government must be a real Christian Democracy.

Churchmen of America, this is your fight. Mothers of America, the power to aid in this great struggle has only recently been given you. In your hands, the ballot is to be more potent for good than the powerful guns of the autocracies have been for evil. If you would be worthy queens of our American homes, you will help us to christianize those homes by snatching them from the clutches of the greatest octopus of wealth that has ever gripped the world, and then help us to make those homes reflect the spirit of the Master.

Let every true American who believes in Jefferson's

promise of Life, Liberty, and Happiness, arise, and with one mighty acclaim say, "*To this great call America will answer.*"

Chapter II

WHAT IS LIFE?

When I was a care-free boy out on the prairies of the great West, I had not seriously thought of the question, "What is Life?"

Time, and the responsibilities of manhood have brought me face to face with this all-important problem. What is the meaning of Life? Is the Life we see all around us what it should be? Is the thing we know as "Life" among our fellow men the fulfillment of God's plan for the human family?

To me, life from early childhood has been filled with serious experiences. Early manhood brought the problem of an education. From that problem,—only half solved,—I went out into an unfriendly world only to realize that the problems of life multiplied in complexity as well as in numbers as time went by.

Students of biology tell us that the question, "What is Life?" has puzzled the wisest philosophers of every generation. One who has made a study of the question from the standpoint of the world's knowledge a century ago says: "In seeking the definition of life, it is difficult to find one that does not include more than is necessary, or exclude something that should be taken in."

De Blainville says: "Life is the two-fold internal movement of composition and decomposition, at once general and continuous."

Herbert Spencer says: "This conception is in some respects too narrow and in some respects too wide."

Summing up the profound wisdom of old school

philosophy, one of the wisest of them all has said: "A perfect definition of life seems to be an impossibility."

But these definitions only relate to life in the abstract. Jefferson laid down as the inalienable rights of man, the right to life, liberty, and happiness, but men sometimes build wiser than they knew. Had Jefferson been asked what he meant by life, as he used the term, he no doubt would have promptly said, "Human life has not always been held sacred by the governments of the world. Life is a sacred right. Your life belongs to you, and no man or government has a right to destroy it until after, in a trial by a jury of your peers, you have been convicted of a crime for which society may demand it."

This was a high conception of the value of human life from Mr. Jefferson's point of view, and the new world applauded it as a step in advance in the world's category of human rights. But is this conception not too narrow for this generation? Did not Jefferson build wiser than he knew? Does not life mean all that Jefferson meant, and more in this era of social development? What, then, is life as we would view its promises in this generation?

There is no doubt that to the multitude of conditions that make up the great mass of the human family, the answer would be as varied as the conditions under which they live. But while this is true, life in an ideal condition of society means more than a simple existence.

As I study this question and its relation to the children of men; as I study the relations of the government to the conditions of Life in this home of Liberty and Freedom; as I contemplate the duty of a government to its people, I am impressed that I must pursue my study of the question out into the realms of human affairs. To do this I must call to my aid members of society

whose opinions will reflect life as they know it, in order to arrive at a conclusion as to its real relations to the promise of Jefferson when he set life down as one of the inalienable rights of man.

I ask a certain rich man, "What is Life?" Here is his reply:

"Life is first of all the right to live, but it is more to me. God has been very good to man. In this world are all the beauties and benefits of nature, put here by an all-wise creator for the comfort and happiness of man. Life to me is the enjoyment of all these God-given blessings to the fullest. In material things God has been very good to me, and while the comforts of life have always been in easy reach, the luxuries have not been denied. To me, the world is a great playhouse in which the children of men are expected to enjoy life to the fullest. I have no patience with the croakings of discontent that are heard on every hand. I can see no reason for complaint."

As I passed along the street of a great manufacturing city I met a woman whose hair was white as snow and whose form was bent with years of toil. I said to her, "Good mother, your years bespeak wisdom, as well as goodness. Will you tell me after your life of long years, 'What is Life?'" She turned her soft blue eyes upon me with an interest that I had not expected as she repeated the question, "What is Life?" I paused for only a moment as she looked at the ground in a deep study, when she turned to me and said, "To me, my friend, life has been a struggle for existence. When I was a girl, life was full of Hope and Promise. How well do I remember the pretty girlish air-castles I built in my imagination. I saw in those day dreams a beautiful home surrounded by comforts and luxuries. One

day Donald came into my life, and on a happy day in June we plighted our troth and were made one in the holy bonds of matrimony. We were full of hope for the future, and as happy as care-free children could be. Twenty years we lived together, lived, and loved, and labored, and hoped. It was not easy, you see, to get along in the world and provide for a family. Oh! how we loved the children, and how we promised them an education and a fine start in life. But work was short sometimes, and there came a time when Donald's worry to get bread was more than he could bear. One day he took a fever, and in just one week I stood by an open grave. I saw my last hope buried there, and turned to go back, no, not to a home, for I have never known a home to call my own, but back to where I stayed. My hair is growing gray now with years of toil and worry. Three of our children followed Donald to their future home, and the others are here working in the factory. Somewhere I have read, sir, that 'Hope springs eternal in the human soul.' I believed it then, for Donald used ever to hope for the future. Not so now; I am older now. Years of bitter disappointments and experiences have taught me some lessons of life. This is a city of factories. Yonder on the hill are beautiful homes, but here in the valley are the tenements of toil. Thousands have spent their lives here building these mansions and, like me, are simply waiting till the good Lord shall call us to come home.

"Yes, I still have hope, but now I hope not for anything in this man-ruled world, but in a country not made with hands eternal in the skies. Some day I shall go to meet Donald. Oh, sir, how I dread to leave my children to the fate of a life in this city of lost opportunity. The factory in this country, sir, closes behind

those who enter as laborers the door of opportunity, of advancement and of a hope for future betterment. Do not ask me 'What is Life,' for the good Lord never intended that life should be what it has been to me, and to those who live in the condition of wage workers. Ask me what life *should* be. I could paint a better picture of what life should be, although I have never had a taste of its sweetness. Now and then I get a glimpse of what seems to me to be the 'ideal thing' some people call life, but I have never realized the thing myself. But I must go to another day of toil, to be followed by still another. This is life to me, whether it be my God-given right or my man-ordained duty."

To a noted clergyman I propounded the same question and he philosophized as follows: "Life, my brother, is what we make it. The good Lord has given His children the earth with all the good things for their comfort and happiness and whether they make the best of all these gifts, and get more or less of happiness out of them, is entirely with the individual. Life to one man cannot mean the same as it will to another. Neither does it mean the same amount of labor. Nor yet does it mean to all men success. To some it must mean failure. Some will get riches, while others will remain poor. Some will develop master minds, while others will achieve little success. The human family is a heterogenous mass of uneven natural abilities, temperaments and conditions. Every condition is necessary in the economic structure of society, and like the many good things God has given us for our enjoyment, the diversity gives interest to everything. Life and its real meaning are best understood when we view them as an evolution toward the life that is to come after death."

A noted sociologist discussed the question as follows:

"You have asked me the question, 'What is Life?' Frankly I admit that no definition has yet been given that seems to compass the whole of life. It is existence first, and as such we have a right to look to government for its protection. The early governments of mankind did not protect man's physical existence. He could be executed without trial, and if a brother saw fit to take his life, no account was taken of the matter. Life was not held sacred, but a new thought was written in the conscience of the world, and that thought said, 'Life is sacred, and the government owes it protection.' The people hailed this new right as a gift from Heaven. It was written into the cornerstone of this republic as one of the inalienable rights of man. Such is the right to life as laid down by the Declaration. Joyously as we hailed this new protection, human society is today fixing a new meaning to the promise. Indeed, when we look at the latter part of the Declaration, we can come to no other conclusion. Life, Liberty, and Happiness. If life in that promise means existence, the promise may be kept as to life, and yet all of liberty and happiness may be lost.

"Life means more than existence. In this world of unequal conditions, unequal opportunities, unequal natural endowments, were this not true, we would have a condition in which the weaker members of society would be crowded to the rear and trampled under foot. One man cannot today with impunity misuse his brother simply because he has superior strength. The law protects the weak against the strong, and no one complains. This is not a physical age. Intellect rules the world today, but does the weaker brother enjoy the protection he should have from the brother who is intellectually stronger in any of the affairs of life?

"It was no small matter when the law said to man, 'Physical power shall no longer rule the world.' But under our complex civilization, the world has more to fear from those who are intellectually strong than it ever had to fear from those who were physically strong. Physical strength in the olden time either measured the prowess of man against man or was used in the brutal conquest of the weaker nation by the stronger, but to-day, when mind is master, a few men may undertake and carry to a successful conclusion the conquest of a nation without the shedding of a drop of blood, aye, without even a suspicion on the part of the people of the intended conquest.

The first duty of a good government is the protection of its weaker members from the injustice of the stronger. The strong are ever able to take care of themselves, but you will ask, "Why need protection?" I answer, "By physical power, and in defiance of every principle of right among men in every age, the strong have overpowered and enslaved the weak." "Physical slavery is abolished in nearly every part of the world today, but can it be said that the world is yet free from involuntary servitude?" I answer, "More men and women are today giving their lives to an invisible and an involuntary servitude in this boasted land of liberty and freedom than ever at one time were held in bondage in any country on earth." I said "invisible and involuntary." It is both. If the men who fought from Sumpter to Appomattox to free four million black slaves knew that the evolution of our modern civilization had enslaved a large per cent of all the people in this free country, not many suns would set until a new emancipation proclamation would be issued, and not many more suns would set before the shackles of industrial slavery would fall, and a new era of life would dawn upon the world.

"What is life? Does a man enjoy the protection guaranteed to him when every cent of his earnings above a scant living is demanded and appropriated by others? Does not a man enjoy more than was guaranteed to him when, by some machination, he is able to appropriate out of the stores of good things produced, without effort, more than he can use, while thousands go unfed and half clad who have done the honest labor to earn their right to them? Is the promise of life kept in its real meaning while a hoard of people enjoy the products of labor to the fullest when they have never produced a penny of wealth? Is the promise of life kept to the man who toils from year end to year end, and after the most rigid economy is able to lay by nothing for a rainy day, while the men we call the 'Captains of Industry,' the world's intellectual conquestors, revel in the luxury of ill-gotten gain?

"Men of America! In this boasted land of opportunity you have a right to your share of the good things produced if you did your share of the labor that produced them. You need it to give you that part of life promised by the Declaration. This conception of life is in keeping with the God-given promises of the modern civilization under which we live. No man, and no nation, can give you your life, your existence, and then keep it inviolate after he has taken away from you the product of your toil. Life means no less than this in Jefferson's Declaration. It must be written into the laws of the land, and its impress must be felt in the lives and in the homes of all the people."

This definition will satisfy the longings of the great army of men and women who toil, and it will bring to the human family the liberty and the happiness promised by the Declaration, and the world must be made to realize it in its fullest meaning.

Chapter III

THE BLIGHT OF WAR

The first problem that confronts America and the world is the problem of crushing forever the possibility of another war. War has blackened the pages of all history. It has been the blight of the world since the beginning of time. One generation has built, and the next generation has destroyed what they built. A desire for conquest has been the underlying cause, and the power has been the only question. Human rights and great principles of government have seldom been the underlying causes of the great wars of the world.

The action of bayonet and bullet in shaping the destinies of the human family have so long been the potent factor that the people have come to think of war as one of the necessary evils of government. There are even those among us who will still argue that a baptism of blood is good for the Nation's ills.

If our writers could dramatize the peaceful struggles of government betterment as vividly as they can picture the scenes and horrors of war we might hope for better success in driving it out of the land, but while the poet, and the painter, and novelist, and our great papers and magazines, and historians are portraying in such graphic story and song the conflict of war, the stories of civic strife in times of peace seem so tame that they are neglected.

It is true that something has been done looking to the prevention of war. We had shared with other nations the organization of The Hague tribunal, but when the whole world was engulfed in the greatest war in all

history, in spite of the protests and powers of that tribunal, we were obliged to share with the world the remorse that comes of disappointed hopes.

That struggle taught the world that we must have some arrangement for the settlement of world disputes that would be enforceable without an appeal to arms, instead of a code of rules for the enforcement of "humane warfare."

In the war just closed millions of men were killed and millions more were wounded. Mankind has been loaded with a burden of debt that will not be paid in ten generations. Nearly every man that was killed was a white man. Every man was a Christian. The Caucasians, the highly civilized peoples of the earth, were murdering and slaughtering each other while the untutored black, brown and red races of the world looked on in astonishment. Cannot the Christian peoples of the world of Caucasian bloods make some arrangement whereby wars can be prevented? This question must be answered, and the Christian peoples of the world must answer it.

Let us not at this moment consider the suffering, nor the sacrifices, nor the broken homes, nor the blighted hopes that war brings to the world, but let us leave out of the discussion for the moment every element of sentiment, and think only of the two phases of war—its awful cost and its awful destructiveness. If there were no other argument than the argument of destructiveness, this alone ought to convince the world that wars must cease or the world must perish. I am not thinking alone of the destructive engines of war with their power to level cities, but more of the power of the newly invented appliances for the destruction of human life. The late war brought to the world a realization of the destructive power of gases, but do we not know that the use of

gases in warfare is only in its infancy? If "humane warfare" was even considered in the prosecution of the world war, it must be written as a fact of history that in the emergencies of impending disaster that deadly gas that had the power to level whole cities was the most inhuman element of warfare that the world has ever witnessed.

Will the world now stop, when world settlements are so pressing and so full of peril, and refuse or neglect to consider the dangers of gas in the possible wars that may come to shower their deadly perils upon us? The power to navigate the air and a gas so deadly that whole armies can be destroyed in an hour is the power that lies at the very threshold of the next war that shall come to destroy democracy and build up the power of autocracy in the world. Do not laugh this solemn fact to scorn, for such a thing is not only possible, but it is imminent.

There is a remedy. That this great christian nation should stand in the way of the consummation of the means of crushing the blight of war and the possibility that the world may ever again be deluged by a catastrophe such as we witnessed in the war just closed is unthinkable.

For six thousand years the world has been building and destroying, and in all that time it has not found time to consider the awful consequences of war and its cost in dollars and cents.

Our civil war cost billions in money and treasure, but we are so prone to forget that we have not considered the penalties of war and its awful consequences in money and the awful struggles the nation must make to pay the debts that war must necessarily incur.

The first cost of the civil struggle is a matter of

record, but we have taken little account that for sixty years the labor of the nation has been taxed to pay the pensions of that war. This tax is today little less than it was fifty years ago. Then, again, only a few people are aware that we are still paying pensions of the Mexican war, and that war was fought nearly a century ago. And this is not yet all. We are still paying pensions of the war of 1812, fought more than a century ago.

But the people are beginning to ask questions. They want to know where all the money goes that is annually paid in taxes for the support of the government.

Dr. Rosa, chief physicist of the Bureau of Standards, from the unimpeachable records of the government, has undertaken to answer this question and his investigations and answers give our annual budget a very queer look.

In his first statement he says: "Out of every dollar we pay in taxes to the government, 92.8 per cent is spent to pay for past and future wars." Battleships, munitions, pensions, reconstruction, military schools. War! War! War! The other 7.2 per cent pays for our Public Education, Reclamation, National Parks, Salaries, Agriculture, Mining, Public Health, and such demands as the boll weevil and hog cholera.

Think of it. Ninety-two and eight-tenths per cent for destruction and only 7.2 per cent for constructive upbuilding.

Must we answer further? We have talked only of dollars and the danger of the extermination of the human family. We have not taken into account the spirit of hate that war engenders. We have not gone with our boys into the trenches. We have not heard the boom of cannon. We have not recorded the loving

messages that our dying boys sent back to mothers, and wives, and sweethearts, nor have we stood by the bedside of the starving women and children whose sons and husbands and fathers gave their lives in defense of their country. We have not heard the wails of the wounded and the dying on the slaughterfields of Europe. Think of all the horrors of war and then answer me, "Is war still to be the arbiter of disputes between the nations of the world?" Must we go on teaching our children the military strategy of war, instead of teaching them the philosophy of peace?

Painter, paint a picture! Make it show what the world might have been had not the curse of war blighted it. Can't you paint it? Can't you paint a world with beautiful homes where peace and plenty and happiness reign? Can't you paint the roadsides parked with beautiful trees and flowers? Painter, can't you paint a world without a single father or son who had been crippled by inhuman shot and shell?

Christian America! The first problem that must be solved before a real christian democracy can be established among men is the problem of crushing out of this nation and the world the spirit of militarism and the blight of war.

War is a relic of the dark ages of strife, and ignorance, and selfishness, and greed, and lust of power. There is no place for war in the institutions of a christian democracy. If there is no place for war in our institutions then there is no place or need for preparedness for war.

If war is to be continued as the policy of this nation in the future, the fault is our own. We have the ballot, and it does not depend at this time entirely upon the votes of men. The ballot is in the hands of every woman

in the land, and there is not a woman who is worthy the affection of a husband or the love of a child who would vote for a continuance of a policy of war in the world.

Do the voters of this nation not know that we have built up a militarism and a spirit of autocracy that is intolerable in a free country? Think of a regular army of 280,000 men in this nation in a time of peace. Can any man tell us why this peace-loving nation would have need for such an army? Three thousand miles of water on our east and four thousand miles on our west, the Great Lakes and a peaceful nation on the north, where not even a garrison of soldiers has been charged with the duty of guarding the interests of either country; on the south a friendly nation that would more quickly aid than combat us in the event of a threatened invasion from an enemy country.

But this is not all that goes with the question of a military aristocracy. This army of 280,000 men is officered by twenty-one major generals, 599 colonels, 2,200 majors, and 4,440 captains. This army of officials is trained in the school of aristocratic militarism, and the retired list of the official head of the army must finally mean that the backs of the already overtaxed people will be bent with the burden of their support.

This nation had reason to believe and hope for some arrangement for disarmament at the close of the world war that devastated Europe and cost this nation so many billions of dollars.

Disarmament would be the symbol of a new hope. The whole world is sick unto death of armaments—because the people know that armaments are certain forerunners of war.

The League of Nations made a specific provision for disarmament, but we, this great nation, halted, and in

the halting we arouse a just suspicion in the mind of the world of our sincerity.

Will anyone blame the nations who were our allies for halting in their program of disarmament in the face of our hesitation?

Disarmament must come to all the nations at the same time, and with an arrangement that shall be just and equitable to all the countries alike.

Will someone explain why this nation should refuse to disarm? Can anyone explain why we should appropriate so many million dollars for warlike preparation if we are in good faith when we talk so entertaingly about the wisdom of disarmament? An appropriation in 1921 of $393,999,999 for the army and $433,999,000 for the navy is too much if we expect our allies to believe in our good faith. Think, then, of the discrepancy between the appropriations for the activities of war and peace. The total appropriations for war and for pensions—which is as truly war's demand—of $1,106,998,999 and the appropriation for agriculture was only $31,000,000.

I am wondering whether the people know just what the item of pensions alone means to the country. I am also wondering whether the people know just what are our war's demands for pensions for the defenders of the nation.

In 1920 there were on the pension roll of the United States 592,190 civil war veterans, 299,363 widows and 885,110 invalids of the civil war. In the same year there were 149 pensioners of the war with Mexico, fought in 1848, and 2,423 widows. At the same time we were paying 71 pensions to widows of the war of 1812, fought 109 years ago, and 30,422 veterans of the Spanish-American war.

We make no complaint of the pensions, but refer to it simply to show how long a war lasts when we must face its after-effects in reconstruction and in pensions.

When I made reference to our "military aristocracy" I did so advisedly. In more than one way it bears the earmarks of an aristocracy. Many people have never known that after spending a whole life in the service of his country, every army officer of high rank goes on the retired list with a princely salary, nor do they know that the same system attaches to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Will someone explain why, after a lifetime of service at a princely salary, any retired officer should be carried on the payroll of the government at any salary at all?

This is simply one of the relics of monarchial Europe which in the early days of this republic fastened itself upon the nation. No explanation has ever been given for the reason for this relic of the past being handed down to this late generation. If a good reason does not exist then it is high time the law was repealed and the practice abolished.

War has carried with it so much waste; it has built up such a powerful force for self-perpetuation; it has so long been tolerated because the people have not known the truth; its tendency toward aristocratic domination of social and political affairs has been so marked that the people have come to look upon the national army with somewhat of awe, instead of realizing that our army is simply an organized and drilled company of real Americans, who have no other rights than those enjoyed by every American citizen, and who are entitled to no more consideration.

Militarism, and the very spirit of militarism, must be destroyed. An army for home protection is the most

that should be tolerated. If it is true, as Dr. Mercher insists, that in the late war it took an average of 395 shells to kill one man, this nation must either get some arrangement to prevent wars or find some cheaper method of killing men. Again, if it is true, as the actuaries of the great insurance companies have decided and fixed in their calculations, that an American boy's life is worth just forty-seven dollars, then this will seem to make the cost of taking that life out of all reason, high.

Must we deal with these awful questions in a spirit of jest to make them impressive? Let the mothers of this nation know that the forty-seven dollars claimed by the actuaries as the price of an American boy's life is the value placed upon the babe she fondled with such pride, the boy whose education she secured with such sacrifice, and the man who went across the waters to fight the battles of his country. This is the same boy who gave his life for the ideals of our great democracy, and that boy was hers.

War must be crushed. Militarism must go down. The people must arise and divorce every sentiment of political rights, and business privilege, and aristocratic cast, from the institutions of defense in this country, and it must be done without delay. Some arrangement must be speedily effected that will prevent future wars. Let no man listen to the argument so often advanced by men who use the little knowledge they possess in urging that because "we have always had war, we always will have war." Such a philosophy would forever close the doors of advancement and progress in the world. Wars can be prevented, and when this nation can speak directly upon the question, the politicians will be made to understand the meaning of their mandate. Whether

such an arrangement shall be the covenant of the League of Nations, rejected by our senate in 1920, or some other arrangement that shall represent the creation of the ideals of the party that rejected the covenant of the League of Nations, the people little care, if that arrangement shall put the United States in a position of full and just partnership and responsibility with the other nations of the world, and bring an enduring world peace. Nothing less than this will reflect the wisdom and the patriotism of this nation, and nothing less than this will lay the foundation for an honorable and a lasting peace.

As these words are being written, the daily papers announce that the President has appointed representatives to sit in the council of the League of Nations, already organized, but that the authority of that representation is limited to questions that directly relate to American interests. Must proud America be humiliated before the world by putting itself in a position of unconscionable selfishness? Must it be said of this great, progressive government that our interests in world peace stops where our selfish commercial interests begin? Is there a single question of reparation, or of industrial adjustments effecting Europe, that is not also a vital concern of this nation? Is this new policy to be one of the distinctly "American Policies" of this administration? Is this nation in the future to sit back and use its influence and power in claiming where American interests are concerned, and then refuse its councils in the questions that disturb the peace of Europe, unless that disturbance shall threaten the commercial interests of America? Has this nation lived to so little purpose that it does not yet know that in the new world in which we live today no nation can live alone? Does the nation

not yet realize that an enduring peace cannot precede justice?

We have already paid an awful price to aid in crushing the autocracy of Germany, but the price of an enduring world peace is not yet paid. At this moment the world is facing another problem that far transcends in complexity and importance any question that the world war ever considered. We have yet to consider the intricate question of economic peace. Economic justice and economic peace. Who can measure the meaning of those terms? Is the world not yet aware that economic injustice and industrial supremacy will be written by future historians as the underlying first cause of every physical conflict of the world, and the strife in the world will never be settled, and the peace of the world will never be assured, until economic justice has been established between the nations of the earth?

If America insists on standing alone, it must make up its mind to be content with a policy of isolation commercially and industrially. You may build a wall around America so high that it will exclude every product of the balance of the world, but when you do this you must be reminded that the same wall that will keep the products of other lands out of America will be just as effective to keep our own products in. Trade must be reciprocal. This great nation cannot live alone. At the close of the war we enjoyed a splendid opportunity for the extension of our commerce into the dark places of the world, but we can never reap the harvest that those opportunities offered unless we extend the olive branch of industrial peace to those who, for the moment, are struggling in the agonies of an industrial upheaval and economic ruin.

America is a great nation. Its economic greatness has

given it an enviable place among the nations of the earth as a result of the war. We fought for an ideal, and not for industrial advantage. With our help the victory was nobly won, but after it was so nobly won, and after we had received the plaudits of mankind, after we had helped to fix in the terms of the armistice an agreement for the establishment of an enduring world peace, after our President had given to the peace councils his presence, and his great wisdom, we halted, and in the bitterest contention that ever disgraced our country, we refused to ratify the treaty that had been made with such patriotic devotion to the greatest cause that ever engrossed the mind of the world since the beginning of time.

World peace was the ideal of our boys. It was the ideal of the 10,000,000 mothers who made the greatest offering that was ever made in all history.

Who was responsible for the defeat of that treaty and the achievement of our ideals? I want to answer this question, for its answer may open the way through which we may even yet wash our hands of this greatest crime that was ever committed against the world, and against our boys who gave their lives for that great ideal.

Were the people of America directly responsible for that crime? With vehemence and in a spirit of patriotism, I resent such an imputation. America stands before the world as a peaceful nation. It was for the ratification of the treaty of Versailles, but when the critical moment arrived it could not speak. It still stands for world peace, and it is trembling at this moment because it well knows that in an attempt to effect the organization of an American association of nations for the prevention of future wars, it will be next to impossible in the face of the already completed organization

of the League of Nations with a membership encompassing nearly the entire world.

Listen, fellow Americans! The League of Nations failed of ratification because of the spirit and the power of a political machine that longed for a place at the nation's pie counter. It was the uncurbed spirit and power of an aristocracy of militarism and commercialism that for half a century has enjoyed more power for evil than such an organization should ever enjoy in a republic of freemen, and last of all, it was the spirit of selfishness that excused the people of this so-called christian nation to seize the golden opportunity to gather into its already bulging coffers the ill-gotten gain of world exploitation. The industrial exploitation we have commonly denominated "profiteering" in our own country, through its power to fix prices, has revealed a spirit of ungodliness that has no parallel in human history. Can any man rightly measure that power? It owns our railroads, our mines, our factories, as well as every other source of production and distribution. It owns everything but the labor to run its machines. And to this labor it has never paid more than enough for a scant living. Let the world know that it was the spirit and the power of "government by party" in this nation that thwarted the only real attempt the world has ever made for the establishment of a workable world peace when it refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations covenant.

If that infamous thing we call "government by party" had never committed another offense for which it deserved to be destroyed, that offense would be sufficient justification. It was an insult to every man who served in our splendid army, and so nobly aided in bringing the great war to a successful close. It was an insult to

every mother who offered her boy on the nation's altar with a promise that this should be a war to end wars. It was an insult to our President, who so nobly represented American ideals in the old world, and brought those nations into such a splendid relation of friendliness that they burned candles in honor of our stars and stripes, and were willing and glad to subscribe to a program of world peace.

Christian America! Hide your face in shame! The ideals of a world peace were your ideals. It was your child. In the name of "government by party" you strangled it after it was born. You did it in spite of the prayers of the christian people of this nation. This proud nation of freemen who owe so much to the guidance of the God of Heaven in its trying days at Valley Forge and in the darkest days of the rebellion, stands today before the world as a nation of slackers.

Is there a single man in this country who believes that the forty-nine nations that at this time constitute the League of Nations can be persuaded to abandon that world organization and begin a new attempt to allign the world around some other arrangement than the treaty of Versailles? The people of America could not speak. We have no machinery through which this nation's will can be made known to its law-makers, but under a christian democracy such as we contemplate we would have commanded our law-makers within thirty days that the great patriotic heart of this nation stood for the redemption of every pledge that we had made to our boys, and to the world, and it would have said that the treaty presented by our President must be ratified, and then if it needed amendment, as it might, it could be done later.

Refusal to ratify the Versailles Treaty and the League

of Nations cost the farmers of this nation more than $6,000,000,000 in the price of foodstuffs alone, and it cost many times that amount in the unconscionable profiteering that its failure made possible. While this nation was paying the penalty in dollars, the starving millions of Europe were paying the penalty in precious lives.

War is still a menace to the peace of the world. The spirit of militarism is not yet dead. The world war brought to the whole world a new vision and a new hope. That vision, and that hope, have been sacrificed upon the altar of political spoils.

The disarmament conference inspires little hope. Success in that conference cannot bind the world because only a few nations will sit in its councils. Is someone saying that all the powerful nations will be there, and that they will, after all, rule the world? If this is true—and it may be true—then we are to begin again just where we began two thousand years ago. The League of Nations now in effect gives promise to the small as well as to the great nations of the world, and their voice in the councils at least gives promise to them of an honorable hearing on every question that effects their welfare.

Is there a single man in America who will dispute that this nation's ideal when it entered the world war was the ideal of enduring peace? If there is still doubt upon this point, let the doubter read the following copy of a letter that was written by a fond mother who had come to the recruiting station to offer her boy upon the nation's altar. Here is what she said:

To My Government:

I come to you today in the name of the ten million mothers who have been asked by the mandate of the law to offer their sons as human sacrifices upon the altar

of this nation, to pay the penalty of the sins of men. No matter how willingly those mothers shall make that great sacrifice, every one of them down deep in her mother-heart will say that war is a crime against the man who must stand before the enemy guns; it is a crime against the mother who bore him, and it is a crime against his country to be asked to offer to the slaughter fields of war the brightest of America's young manhood.

To these mothers who are asked or commanded to make this sacrifice this nation must make answer, and that answer must point out a reason that shall appeal to the christian conscience and the patriotism of the mothers who are asked to offer their boys upon the nation's altar.

We have been told that conscription relates only to men. Can this be possible? Does not our government know that war's necessities are not alone men behind the guns? Have we not learned that we must have guns as well as men behind them? Ask the mothers of Europe. They will tell you that in war the nation must have money to buy arms and food and clothing for the men. If this is true, will you still tell us that conscription relates only to men?

I want to ask: Are the rich men of the nation doing their part in the prosecution of the war? Oh, you say, that they have responded freely by buying Liberty Bonds.

Listen to the mothers of the boys! If a rich man laid a million dollars upon the nation's altar as a gift, and a mother placed upon that same altar her precious son, which has made the greater offering to the nation?

Then they tell us that this is a war to maintain the rights of democracy in the world. Suppose we win, will

the world democracy we make safe give promise of a world peace? A world peace is a lofty ideal, but the mothers of this land want to know when they make the human offering whether that offering is made with a promise that when the war is won it will bring to the world a realization of a world peace.

The mothers of this land will ask and demand that the first question to be settled at the green table after the war is over, shall be the question of an enduring world peace. A world democracy is not enough. Our boys, to fight their best, must have a higher ideal, and that ideal must be an enduring peace.

As we bring our boys to you today, it is with the understanding that they are to fight for a world peace, and that understanding is registered in High Heaven.

Oh, my fellow countrymen! The realization of this ideal will cost much blood and treasure, but, be it the precious blood of our sons or the treasure that is represented by money, it will all be worse than lost unless it shall bring to the world an enduring peace for all the world alike.

It is with this understanding and with this promise that we bring our boys to you today, and that promise must be redeemed to our boys and to their mothers.

Chapter IV

A WORLD PEACE

When idealistic America hearkened to the call, "Come over in Europe and help us," we knew the dangers that threatened the world. For nearly two years the unequal struggle had been going on. It was a struggle between the greatest military autocracy that ever disgraced the world and the spirit of democracy. The old world never before realized what Prussianism meant to them. That Prussianism had no vision, but for the future dominance not of Europe alone, but of the world.

This nation responded to that call with a burning hope that the coming victory—which was certain when we entered the war—would bring the opportunity, and open the way, for a permanent peace. What a vision! What an opportunity! What an argument the great calamity would offer for some arrangement for a permanent peace! From the day we entered the great struggle the eyes of the whole world turned toward America. As the war progressed the pen of our President, with a splendid idealism, and the dashing bravery of our American soldiers, shattered the sword of Prussianism, and the peasants of all Europe burned candles in honor of our Stars and Stripes. Those burning words and lofty ideals captured the conscience of the world, and the new doctrine of equal rights of small, as well as great, nations was propounded for the first time in all history.

Does anyone wonder that the great common people of Europe saw a new vision and had a new hope? Is there a single American whose heart did not swell with pride

when he read the stories of those oppressed peoples burning candles in honor of their liberators? "Equal rights of all nations, great and small." Will anyone think that little Belgium, the doormat of Europe, would not understand and rejoice for this protection? Surely you think that this was a cause for rejoicing, but what was the promise? We told our boys that this was a war to end wars. We promised them that when peace was declared the terms of that peace must provide for the permanent peace of the world. The last of the fourteen points upon which the armistice was based was a promise for a League of Nations assuring the permanent peace of the world. That promise was signed by every belligerent in the war. Its formation into a workable compact, and the shaping of a world sentiment willing to sacrifice individual rights for the common good, and for the great settlements contemplated in that compact, was the greatest diplomatic undertaking the world has ever winessed.

In my mind, I am standing on one of the great battlefields of France. I can see, row upon row, of crosses that mark the last resting place of our gallant boys who gave their lives for that great ideal, World Peace. Among the crosses millions of poppies in full bloom shed their splendid beauty upon the scene. A man stood among those crosses with bent form, and in his face the evidence of a weight of sorrow. I heard a voice that seemed to come with a measured accent and sadness as he said,

"We are the dead.
Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset's glow.
Loved and were loved, but now we lie in Flanders'
Field."

His head poised, and his face was turned toward America as he continued,

"To you from failing hands we throw the torch.
Be yours to lift it high.
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders' Field."

Americans! Did we lift the torch high? Did we redeem the promise we made our boys and the world? Three years have passed since the armistice was signed, and we are still at war with Germany. We have witnessed the most vitriolic political fight that ever disgraced any nation on earth. Our senate refused to ratify the League of Nations covenant and the treaty with the central powers that was created with so much sacrifice and so much hope. By that refusal we, as a nation, must assume the responsibility and the chagrin of defeating the first real attempt that was ever made to secure the peace of the world. While we halted the whole world trembled between economic ruin and bolshevism. The unrest of the whole world argued for ratification of the treaty. The churches prayed for it. The starving millions of Europe plead for ratification before High Heaven, while they saw their women and children dying before their helplessness, but we refused.

Our failure to ratify the treaty of Versailles, and the profiteering made possible through that failure, shocked the conscience of the entire world, and it lost to this great-hearted nation of patriots that splendid position we had so nobly earned as we fought in the trenches and by their sides in the great struggle. "Rome fiddled while the world starved." This cruel political mistake cost the farmers of this nation more than six billion

dollars in the price of their crops alone; it brought no relief to the consumers, and it branded this nation as a nation that will not redeem its promises.

The promised peace has come as best it might through the agencies of the forty-nine nations of the world who had seen the sword of Prussianism shattered, and through whose awakened conscience they were ready to crush the possibility of another war. They knew the horrors of war first hand, and so earnest were they to have their war pledges fulfilled that they did not wait for this nation, but completed the organization of the league as contemplated.

That the reader may get a complete and an official understanding of the beginnings of the "League of Nations," we quote from a pamphlet entitled, "Three Months of the League of Nations," published by the "World Peace Foundation," Boston:

"The League of Nations is a reality. Modestly and democratically it began to function this morning at ten-thirty o'clock, when the council opened its first meeting in the clock room of the French Foreign Ministry.

"Nine men gathered about a green-covered table in one end of the salon of crimson and gold and put in motion the machinery of the most ambitious experiment in government man has ever essayed, while a hundred or more diplomats from the four corners of the earth looked on.

"The sunlight, which heaven sent to bless the day, shone through the windows overlooking the Seine, and the sunlight threw a shadow across the green-covered table, the shadow of a vacant chair. All who were there saw the shadow and remarked that the chair was empty and regretted it, and all agreed to keep the chair waiting until America should come to fill it."

The shadow of the empty chair grew bolder in outline when Leon Bourgeois in his speech said:

" 'Today, gentlemen, we are holding the first meeting of the council convened by the President of the United States. The task of inaugurating this great international institution, which opens so wide a field for humanity, should have fallen to President Wilson. We regret the reasons which still delay the final decision of our friends in Washington, but we may express the hope that these last difficulties will soon be overcome and that a representative of the Great American Republic will occupy the place which awaits it among us. The work of the council will then assume that definite character and that peculiar force which should be associated with it.'

"Lord Curzon, speaking for the British Empire, concluded his address with an appeal for American participation in the League. He said, 'While I am in agreement with all M. Bourgeois has said, I should wish especially to express my full concurrence as regards the United States of America. The decision must be her own, but if, and when the United States elects to take her place in the new council chamber of the nations, the place is vacant, and the warmest welcome will be hers.' "

This modest beginning of the League of Nations, which included all our allies in the war, seems modest indeed when we realize that at this time forty-nine nations of the earth have joined the League, and more are ready, but are waiting for specific remedies of disqualification.

The chair in the council chamber of the League of Nations is still vacant. America still halts. The eyes of the world are still on America. The world stood in as great need of the councils of this nation since the signing of the armistice as it did when they cried out to us,

"Come over into Europe and help us." They had a right to expect the leadership of America in the solution of the complex problems of the world organization. To withhold it and to refuse to ratify the treaty and the League of Nations was the greatest political crime that was ever commited in the name of civilized diplomacy.

Do you remember the story of the king who, with his wives and the elect of his court, were reveling in the luxuries of autocratic extravagance? And do you remember that in the midst of that revelry a human hand, without a body, appeared writing upon the wall? The king was frightened. He howled for help. The queen could not comfort him. The company dispersed, and in their homes they locked the doors and hid under the beds, but it was too late.

They did not know what the writing meant. The king called that gallant young lion-tamer and prophet, and he told them what it meant. One of the words of the writing was "Tekel," and the message meant, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting."

America! Be not deceived! Yours was a wonderful mission. It was full of promise, but it was also full of responsibility. You have not measured up to your responsibilities, and you have failed to keep your promises. You promised our boys and you promised the world. It was done in the open and the world thought it was done in good faith. The world has been waiting so long for the solution of the problem of war that it has become discouraged. America was in a splendid position to aid. It had given first aid, but the world needed more. American thought and American life are afire with a portentous unrest. These fires are internal. They are red hot. They cannot be quenched until the dregs of unrighteousness are burned out. The very

foundations of our civilization are imperilled, and we are crying to God for help. The world is sick with a sickness that is not entirely the result of war. Wealth has been wasted faster than it has been created. The waste of human life by bombs, and gas, and bullets was stopped with the signing of the armistice, but the waste of life by starvation, and the waste of wealth by profiteering and exploitation still goes on unchallenged. Bankruptcy is staring the smaller nations in the very face, and bolshevism in its varied forms stalks broadcast throughout the world. While most of the man power of the world seems worse than lost, our statesmen and financiers prattle about reconstruction. The war was fought to crush militarism and end wars, but the nations—and our own nation as well—are still building navies in the name of peace and exploiting the world in the name of civilization.

It will not do to say that America has spoken upon the question of war or upon its endorsement of the League of Nations. The Christian conscience of this great nation is against the horrors of war, and it would so record its verdict with an almost unanimous vote if the question were submitted to the people without the entanglements of partisan prejudice. Talk about reconstruction while we are still in the state of war, and while we are spending more for an army and a navy than we spent while the war was on, is worse than futile. Talk about disarmament while this great and powerful nation is holding aloof from the League of Nations to put an end to future wars is the sheerest folly. We must have an enduring peace. Enduring peace simply fulfills the promise of the Christ, and to continue a policy of militarism and armaments and war is to invite, if not to force, the utter collapse of our civilization.

When war and the war spirit are crushed, when disarmament is made general and effective, when the world has given itself wholly to the philosophy of peace, then we can turn our faces toward a glorious future, and say to our boys who are sleeping today in Flander's Fields:

"Sleep on, brave boys, America was true,
We have redeemed the pledge we made to all the world and you.
We lifted high the torch you threw from failing hands,
Its light brought peace to all the world, and joy shall reign,
While you shall sweetly sleep in Flander's Field."

Chapter V

THE NATION'S DANCE OF DEATH

As early as the Fourteenth century the last enemy of man was represented by the use of simple images to illustrate the universal power of death. Sometimes these images represented the husbandmen watering the ground with blood, or planting it with swords, or rooting out weeds, or plucking up flowers, or sowing the ground with corpses. Not infrequently they were represented by monarchs assembling their armies, and inviting them to festivals, or citing them to judgment. This was "The Dance of Death." For centuries the dance of death in some form or another was the national expression of a universal cry of despair.

In these days when the world is grappling with after-war problems of reconstruction; when the faith of the world is shaken almost into a positive disbelief in men and governments; when nearly every government of earth is on the verge of anarchy and bolshevism, is it any wonder that the people of America are crying out for a leader, not to lead them in a dance of death, but to lead them into a new hope for the future before it is too late?

Thinking men of the world are beginning to wonder when all this chaos and unrest will end.

The most monumental blunder of all time was the commission of that crime that brought on the world war. From the day it was committed until the armistice was signed, and even to the present time, the results of that crime became more monumental.

Long before we entered the war our munitions manu-

facturers were profiteering off the misfortunes of the already war-torn countries of Europe.

While the people of America were eating war bread to save food for our allies, the profiteers were laying the foundation of great fortunes. While our boys were dying on the battlefields of Europe, their mothers and sisters and sweethearts were at home providing bandages to bind up the wounds they knew were certain, and their fathers were furnishing food to supply their strength to fight. When they returned to their homes, then they learned that while they had been across the waters fighting for the ideals of a world democracy at a dollar a day, the men who stayed at home, the profiteers, had made certain their future fortunes over the dead bodies of their fallen heroes. They had not thought of the sacrifices that were being made for them on the other side of the waters. Their ideals were not the ideals of a world democracy. *They* had never heard that appeal of Colonel McCrae when he stood among the poppies in Flanders' Field, and looking anxiously out toward America, said:

"To you from failing hands we throw the torch.
Be yours to lift it high.
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders' Fields."

When the war was over, the world had a right to hope for a serious attempt at reconstruction, but instead, it seemed that the whole world had gone mad. Profiteering was running rampant in every industrial activity. Nowhere in history can be found a period so portentous as the period through which we are at this time

passing. The people are clamoring for readjustments, for new alignments, for new laws, and for new conditions. All these are the righteous demands of a newborn world.

The war has brought to the American mind an industrial condition that has no precedent in the memory of man. We have been thinking in terms of billions instead of millions. We have been demanding more money for public boards, we have multiplied the activities of government by additions to the army of public employes; we have swelled the flood of public bonds; we have doubled public salaries; and to pay for all these added burdens we have suddenly awakened to the fact that bonds and salaries must be paid in taxes, and this must mean increased taxation.

Federal taxes have increased eight times since 1913, only eight years ago. State taxes in Nebraska are seven times as great as they were in 1917, four years ago, and in every state in the Union the same condition exists.

The total burden of public indebtedness has increased in eight years from $50 per capita to more than $300 for every man, woman and child in the country.

There is no corresponding increase in wealth or in population. In Nebraska, during the last fourteen years, state taxes have increased over five hundred per cent, while the valuation of the property has risen only eighty-one per cent, and the gain in population has been almost negligible by comparison.

What has occurred in Nebraska has occurred in every state in the Union, and the people everywhere are groaning under the burden that their taxes impose.

They tell us that the war is over, but our congress is at this time appropriating more money for the army, the

navy and for pensions than was appropriated when all the world was in the grip of the most frightful war in all history. Yes, today, when we are at peace with the whole world, we have appropriated more money for war than any nation on earth ever dreamed of appropriating or spending on preparation for war prior to 1914.

Is this peace loving nation to lead the world to suicide by taxation? Are we to stand before the world in time of peace as a more menacing militarism than Germany ever was?

But it is not only for militarism that we are being so unmercifully taxed. Legislatures have run wild. Cities have followed the example, and from the school district to the government, the nation is being taxed to the limit. We are destroying government by taxation. We are confiscating the homes of the people. They are clamoring for relief. They are crying out that the nation is in more danger from the taxing power in the hands of the government's public servants than it ever was from any foreign invader.

The relief from the burdens for which the people clamor must be found in some fundamental solution to the whole problem of revenue. I will not need to tell the people that from the very earliest government the problem of revenue has been one of the most perplexing problems with which we have been obliged to grapple, and that at no time in our history has the problem been more perplexing and more menacing than it is at this moment.

In our title we have asked the question, "What's the matter with our Uncle Sam?" and our answer to this question would be incomplete if we failed to discuss in a somewhat extended manner the whole problem of revenue.

To this task we devote ourselves with many misgivings, for we well know that upon the question of revenue and taxation there has ever been a well-defined difference of opinion.

Nothing is more fundamental than the underlying first principles of taxation. In the abstract, the principles are simple, but when we come to make the application of those principles to the concrete problems that must be solved, we find the minds of the people at variance.

Taxation is simply the price every man must pay for the protection of government. Protection of government, and support of that government by the payment of taxes, is as sacred a contract between the citizen and his government as though it were signed and acknowledged before a court. The taxing power of the government has never been disputed, but the manner of levying the tax and the application of the tax burdens to all citizens alike has been the subject of much contention.

The people have never been convinced that equality of taxation has ever existed, or that it exists at this time. Whether this feeling of inequality of taxation is grounded in fact is a question that must be set at rest. The complaints have been bitter. The charge of tax-dodging is as old as the world. Some classes of property are ever in the plain sight of the assessor, while other properties are easily hidden from his view.

It will not do to say that every tax schedule has an oath appended, and a sacred oath is a sufficient safeguard. There was a time perhaps in our history when a sacred oath was held more binding than it is today. Today the oath is little protection when men set out to defeat the operation of a law that is so necessary even as the laws of revenue and taxation.

But we want to record that there is a very general spirit of fairness yet among the people, and a willingness to pay a full share of the tax for the support of government, if every citizen can be made to do the same.

Are the complaints that we hear on every hand of tax-dodging among the people well grounded? Is there serious tax-dodging among the people? These are the questions that must be answered in this discussion, for these are the things that must be set at rest before any just settlement of the question is to be realized.

The discussion of this question must be made from the standpoint of the state as a unit, because from the state alone can be had records that are valuable in ascertaining the exact facts upon which an opinion can be based. These facts as they relate to Nebraska are no doubt substantially the same as they will be found in every state in the Union.

It must be admitted at the outset that a perfectly correct statement cannot be had as to the amounts of assessed value in urban and rural districts, because in so many cases there is in the reports of the auditor an overlapping that must render the reports subject to some uncertainty. In the following tables the assessment in Nebraska for 1920 is shown as to the lands and their improvements, as well as the stock and grain, to belong to the rural districts or to the farmers, while the urban properties are shown in a separate table. In each case we have allowed for any overlapping so that each table will show with as much accuracy as is possible the exact amount of the state taxes paid by each class.

The following table is for the rural assessments itemized as they are itemized by the State Auditor, and the values given are the values upon which the levy was made rather than the actual value for which the prop-

erty was assessed, which is five times the amount of the assessed value:

TABLE OF RURAL ASSESSMENTS, NEBRASKA, 1920

Improved lands	$ 334,039,165
Unimproved lands	80,369,878
Improvements on lands	31,939,868
Cattle	30,017,588
Horses	11,774,775
Hogs	5,789,598
Poultry	1,386,442
Sheep	401,973
Wheat	1,688,442
Corn	5,662,878
Oats	891,333
Alfalfa Hay	452,118
Pop Corn	31,857
Kaffir Corn	31,192
Barley	40,732
Speltz	5,042
Alfalfa Clover Seed	25,103
Potatoes	29,478
Hay and Alfalfa	439,983
Broom Corn	25,117
Farm Implements	9,795,585
Two-thirds of Automobiles	8,552,144
Total Nursery Stock	13,913
Improvements on State Lands	1,647,954
Bees	29,725
One-half of All Household	5,553,976
One-third of Nebraska Corporations	1,089,744
One-half Telephone Companies	2,504,716
One-half All Credits, Money Loaned	5,239,409
One-half All Money on Hand	11,237,674

TABLE OF URBAN ASSESSMENTS, 1920

One-half All Household	$ 5,553,976
All Goods and Merchandise	19,819,170
All Typewriting Machines	179,482
Cash Registers	106,096
All Stocks in Corporations	307,096
All Franchises of Any Description	271,360
All Other Property	2,388,169
Stock in National Banks	4,243,331
Stock in State Banks	4,625,600
Public Utility Corporations	4,290,052
Foreign Inc. Companies	82,227
Accident and Fire Insurance Companies	1,252,495
Foreign Insurance Companies	1,007,224
Express Companies	132,353
Telegraph Companies	248,820
Pipe Lines	145,820
Two-thirds Nebraska Corporations	2,179,488
One-half Telephone Companies	2,504,716
Office and Furnace Fixtures	1,666,360
Property of Railroads	60,851,325
Billiard and Pool Tables	74,081
One-third Automobiles	5,135,073
Town Lots and Improvements	111,302,858
One-half of Credits, Money Loaned	5,239,409
One-half Money in Banks and Trust Companies	11,327,674
Moving Picture Shows	51,181
Tax Sales	173,691
Fire and Burglar Proof Safes	77,777
Money Paid to Building and Loan Ass'ns.	756,066
Book Accounts Due	1,947,800
Stock in Elevators	791,414

It must be understood that in making the comparisons between the property assessed as urban and rural, it is not done in this manner with the intention of awakening prejudice, but it is done in this manner simply to establish facts upon which a basis may be found for some final adjustment that will remove any cause for complaint.

The revenue problem is one of the complex problems of the world. The middle classes insist that the rich hide their property from the assessor, and in so doing they, in effect, refuse to bear their full share of the burden of government. The farmers insist that the commercial classes are in a position to pass the taxes on to the consumers, to those who must patronize them in one way or another in the processes of distribution. Right or wrong, the causes for complaint must be removed. Some remedy must be found that will set at rest even a suspicion that every citizen who enjoys the protection of government does not bear his full share of the tax that goes to the support of the government.

But the question at issue at this time is, "Are the suspicions entertained by the people well grounded?" Is it true that the commercial interests of the state and the nation are either passing their tax on to the other fellows, or dodging the tax entirely by refusing to assess the property, and if so, can a remedy for this be found?

These questions must be answered, and if the complaints are found to be true, then a remedy must be promptly applied.

The reports of the Auditor of State furnish the only means of getting at the bottom facts as they relate to the amounts the several classes pay toward the support of the government. This biennial report is a silent witness to these facts that will not be disputed.

Analysis of these returns is another matter. Such an analysis as will reflect the exact truth is rendered most difficult because in some instances the overlapping values in rural and urban districts are not easily adjusted so as to be certain of their perfect correctness. It will be seen that no man can tell with perfect accuracy just what per cent of the automobiles, household goods, corporation stock, telephone stock, money in banks, stocks in banks, and other classifications of the property, belongs to the rural and how much belongs to the urban classes.

Because of this overlapping and consequent uncertainty we have made our divisions of these values after making inquiry of well-informed and impartial citizens, who have had the best opportunity to know, and we believe they will be found substantially correct. But where there has been the greatest uncertainty we have in every instance given the urban class the benefit of the doubt by favoring that side of the ledger balance in the estimate.

From the table on rural values we find that the value of all properties belonging to the farms and distinctly owned by the rural classes were assessed in 1920 at $551,141,375, and that the urban properties were returned at the value of $211,143,536, while the grand total assessed value of the State of Nebraska for the same year was $762,284,909.

These tables reveal a very startling condition. While the real estate mortgages of the entire state amount to more than $400,000,000 and the chattel mortgages to more than $141,426,200, the property of the entire state is assessed at only $762,284,909, and of this amount the rural assessment or the farm property is assessed at $551,141,373.

This calls to mind one of the marked tendencies of our modern civilization. It is the fixed determination of certain classes of business interests to shift the burdens of government. Only a few years ago a demand was made for the passage of a law exempting real estate mortgages from taxation under a contract that the mortgagor would pay the entire tax on the land covered by the mortgage. Under the argument that such a law would relieve the unfair double taxation that had vexed the law-makers so long, and at the same time furnish a favored investment for the local funds of the people the law was passed. So satisfying was this special privilege that in only a short time the people seeking exemption in that manner realized the complete exemption of all real esate mortgages within the state.

While under the old law only a small per cent of the real estate mortgages in the state found their way to the assessors' books, at this time the state and the nation alike have awakened to the unpleasant fact that in the state we have surrendered the right to tax more than $400,000,000 of real estate mortgage, and so popular has this special privilege come to be that the last census discloses that in the United States real estate mortgage exemptions total more than $27,000,000,000. This simply means that at the suggestion, or on the demand of the money lending classes of the nation, the entire burden of taxation represented by this vast accumulation of wealth was, without agitation and without a struggle, unloaded upon the already tax-burdened people who must go out into the fields and produce the things that must go to the very existence of every man, woman and child of the nation.

Was it right to stamp this as a "tendency of our modern civilization? Is it right to classify mortgages as

property? Do not the owners of these preferred tax exempted properties appeal to the government-supported courts for protection many times, while the owners of our farms would never find an occasion to ask for protection once?

Exemption of property from taxation is nothing less than a special privilege. It is based on no principle of right, and it is nothing less than a desire to reap where others have sown. The law must be repealed, and a law must be enacted that will secure to the people that the burden of taxation will be shared alike by every owner of property that may demand the protection of government.

I cannot refrain from calling attention in this connection to another law granting a special privilege in Nebraska and no doubt in other states. Everybody understands how the laws have protected the people from unjust interest rates by the passage of our usury laws. Under these laws the legal rate of interest in Nebraska is 7 per cent and the contract rate is 10 per ecnt, while the taking of more than 10 per cent renders the contract for the payment of interest null and void, and not collectible. These laws were made to protect the business interests of the country from the rapacity of greedy money lenders, but for half a century little account has been taken of that class of people who have no credit at the bank, and could not borrow a cent of money in an emergency. No man with a family under the best economic conditions can be free from the necessity of borrowing money. That necessity may be sickness, or death, or the loss of a job, but every such case is a real signal of distress.

There is not a city in the land in which a cry of distress has not revealed a story of extortion by loan sharks

who disgraced and disregarded the law and charged every penny of interest that the necessities of the distress would consent to pay.

The loan shark has disgraced every city of America. He has fattened upon the distress of helpless widows and unfortunate poor. He has plied his illegal traffic in spite of the laws that protect the well-to-do. So necessary has become the demand for money from those who cannot borrow at the bank, and so clamorous have become those who wanted to fatten on the distress of those who faced starvation that an appeal was made in Nebraska only six years ago for the passage of a special law for the regulation of the "loan shark." This was another appeal for special legislation, and this appeal also was heeded. This appeal was made in the name of the distressed poor who were not able to borrow in the regular way, but the poor were never heard as to the necessity of such legislation. They were never asked. The special legislation was not asked for their benefit, for no man and no legitimate business can pay a rate above 10 per cent for money and live. This so-called "Loan Shark Law" provides for licensing men to take usury, and gives them the sanction and protection of the laws of Nebraska.

A special law and a special privilege for whom? Was this law passed for the protection of the thousands of men and women in Nebraska who in their distress must either pay the demands of the usurer or go to the poor house? Under this special privilege law six powerful corporations have been licensed in the state of Nebraska, for what? To do what under the regular usury laws of the state would render the contract void as to the interest and not collectable by law. Few people outside of the cities know that such a law has

been written into the statutes of the state. Few people have had opportunity to know of the nefarious practices of the usurer. Few people outside the cities know how many people must either go to the usurer to relieve distress or seek charity, or the poor house.

The taking of usury is legalized crime. Under it one class is protected from the greed and rapacity of the usurer, while in the same statute, in the same state, the people who most stand in need of protection must seek to spell over their urgent needs by depending upon legalized usurers. The law should be repealed. The necessity of those who are in distress should be looked after by men who have hearts that beat in sympathy with those who are in trouble, instead of those who, like vultures, are ready to pounce upon and destroy even the widows and orphans of the men who have been unfortunate in the struggle of life. Tax-free mortgages and legalized usury are a disgrace to a liberty-loving people. They were intended as a special privilege to a class already favored. There are no legal exemptions for the farmer. His property always finds its way to the assessor's schedule, from his farm to his cows and his wife's chickens.

But we must study the tables further. These silent witnesses must speak volumes to students of the times. They tell a story that cannot be disputed. The average man has little opportunity to know the facts. He has little time for study. He knows when he pays his taxes whether it is more or less than it was the previous year, but he has little opportunity of knowing just why it is higher or lower.

The assessment of the credits of the state have attracted little attention. The country store does much business on credit. The wholesalers are all the time

carrying accounts running into millions of dollars. The banks report their loans and discounts, every one of which represents obligations for future payment of money. This state is perhaps one of the worst chattel mortgage ridden states of the Union. Every chattel mortgage represents an obligation for future payment and is the security given for the payment of the obligation when it matures.

Under credits of these characters we find that the entire state assessed in 1920 the pitiful sum of $10,478,000. The state and national banks reported at about the same date loans and discounts amounting to $513,000,000. Every dollar loaned or discounted under that statement represented an obligation of some man or company for the future payment of the amount fixed in the obligation. A large per cent of the country stores of the state had credits running into a total of millions of dollars. The implement men of the state sold wagons, plows, binders, spreaders, threshing machines, and much other merchandise on credit, and all these credits should have been returned for assessment. The loan sharks, of whom we have just been speaking, have thousands of dollars loaned and drawing interest. Can it be possible that with the loans and discounts in banks, with the credits in the hands of merchants and wholesalers, and with the money represented in the millions of dollars in the chattel mortgages of the state that all together they amount to only the sum at which they were assessed? Nobody will dispute the report of the State Auditor in 1920 when he reported that in that year $141,426,800 of new mortgages had been filed, and none will deny that every county had many thousands of dollars in chattel mortgages that have been in force for several years, making a total under this item of several million more

than was estimated in the amounts filed in 1920.

This is an awful record, and under present means of knowing no man can tell just how much assessable property of this character has failed to find its way to the assessor's schedule.

This is not all that must be considered. We find that the state and national banks of the entire state, and from all other sources returned for taxation, $8,915,650 under the head of "Stock in State and National Banks." From the biennial report of the Bureau of Banking we ascertain that the state and national banks of the state are capitalized at $52,699,400. In 1920 they returned for assessment only $8,915,660.

No class of business has ever been so favored in the community as the banks. Their opportunity for service is great, but that opportunity opens up many fields for profit. While the state assessor finds only $22,655,348 under the head of "Money on hand in banks and trust companies," the quarterly statement of the banks shows deposits amounting to $500,000,000, and while he finds only $10,478,800 under "Credits and money loaned," their statements of loans and discounts are more than $513,000,000.

If there were more than $500,000,000 on deposit in the banks of the state, someone must have owned that money and it should have been returned for assessment, and if the banks of the state had more than $513,000,000 in loans and discounts then it is safe to say that the entire state should have assessed more than $10,478,818.

We must not forget that the amount returned for assessment under credits and money loaned includes every dollar returned for the entire state including every man who had money on hand or in banks or whether the money was represented by credits at the bank or in

some other manner was in the form of a credit at the date of assessment.

We do not charge that the banks deliberately misstated their obligations in the assessment of their property, but we do charge that under the special privileges granted by law, not of Nebraska alone, but of every state in the Union, the banks have furnished the means through which millions of dollars have escaped the payment of their just obligations in the form of taxes.

What we have just said in relation of the amounts returned for assessment under the heads of "money on hand in banks" and under "credits and money loaned" does not relate entirely to the failure of the banks to return what has already been accounted for in their statements to the banking department of the state, but just as well to the thousands of men and women who owned these deposits and credits and refused or neglected to return them for assessment.

The greatest problem of the century is some means of forcing the assessment of the property of the nation, for as certainly as a day of adjustment may come, the people will learn that a large share of the assessable property of the state and nation fails every year to bear its share of the burden of government, but it has never failed when the time came for putting into effect great organized schemes for exploitation of the unwary middle classes, who are too busy to study the problems of revenue for themselves.

A remedy must be found. The money that represents stored wealth must be compelled to pay its full share of the taxes.

But the banks are not the only people who are under suspicion of having failed to return their full amount of property to the assessors. Under the head "All goods

and merchandise" we assessed in 1920 the sum of $18,818,200. This must include every stock of merchandise either on sale or in wholesale houses, from the country grocery to the city department store, and from the largest wholesale houses in every city and in every line of merchandise to the country retailer who must have some stock on hand on the first day of April. It must include every automobile in the hands of distributors, threshing machines, plows, binders, shellers, and a thousands other items of merchandise such as lumber, coal, meat in cold storage that belong somewhere and should find their way to the assessor's books and bear their share of the government's burdens. Will anyone venture a guess that the cities of Omaha and Lincoln alone did not have more merchandise on the first day of April than was assessed in Nebraska? And if this condition is possible in Nebraska, what must be the condition in the states where there are many large cities with their wealth piled mountain high? We look again and we find that under the item "All book accounts due" the entire state assessed only $1,947,800. We are tempted to ask, Have the people suddenly adopted a policy of paying cash at the country grocery? Have the wholesale houses of the state closed their accounts with the retailers? Have the small merchants in every town in the state gone to a cash basis? For many years we have been told of the enormous credit business of the country, but must we admit that all the credits of the state and nation, all the obligations for future payment have been avoiding the payment of their share of the tax? This seems to be the only reasonable conclusion, but you will say that the merchant has a right to deduct his bills payable from his bills receivable when he makes his return. This is true, but this would simply emphasize what we have already said as to the item of

credits, which are obligations for payment just as truly as though they represented notes at the bank, or to some friend, and they should find their way to the assessor's schedule.

One of the mysteries of the problem of revenue has been the assessment of the stock in the incorporated companies of the state. Under the item "Stock in incorporated companies" in 1920 we found only $307,096. Men who have been in touch with Nebraska's growth for the last forty years will be amazed at this statement. They will not be able to reconcile the assessment of this small sum as stock in the corporations of the state with their knowledge of the rapid growth of the incorporated companies of the state during the last forty years, and the error or miscarriage of justice will simply shock their belief in what they see with their own eyes.

From the biennial report of the Secretary of State November 30th, 1918, which was the last report available for this examination, we find that the legally incorporated companies of the state had an aggregate capital stock of $194,471,868. This does not include suspended companies and we must conclude that all this capital stock was in effect on that date. Six very busy years have passed since that report was made. They were war years, when new companies were organized over night. We are informed that about twelve hundred new companies have been added every year since that report was made. There is no report showing the exact amount of paid up capital stock in these corporations, but in these days when the commercial world is thinking in billions instead of millions, it is safe to say that in the six years for which the record has not been compiled at least half as many dollars of capital stock has been authorized as were authorized during the

period which had previously been reported. If this is true, we would have $291,707,802 of capital stock in effect at this time.

Authorized capital stock seldom represents the exact amount of paid up capital, and the amounts authorized in some instances will fall short of the real stock upon which the company depends in the conduct of its business, but we must not lose sight of the fact that in a great many of the incorporated companies of the state the authorized capital has enhanced in value sometimes to double and sometimes treble its face value. Thus in Nebraska we have 1,009 state banks the capital stock of which in nearly every instance is worth a premium of from 50 to 100 per cent. A few of the companies have suffered a depreciation in their stock, but most of such companies have long ago been eliminated from this calculation by having been suspended. It is safe to say that there were many companies in the state the stock in which represented many times the actual value of their stock returned for assessment.

Such a condition as this reveals should not be tolerated. There is no reason why the invested capital of the state should not bear its full share of the burdens of government.

But the assessment of the corporations we have just mentioned does not relate to that class of corporations known as public service corporations. The public service corporations of the state are valued for assessment at $2,686,942. There is no ready means of knowing the exact number of public service corporations in the state, but we know that there are many millions of dollars represented in these companies. This class of corporations include the traction and gas companies as well as the telephone companies of the state.

Public service corporations are in a class by themselves. They enjoy the special protection of the laws. When they fail to reap a revenue that will return a fair dividend on the capital invested they immediately appeal to the courts for the protection promised by the laws. Without a single dissent the courts come to their relief, and no one complains, but the people are beginning to ask why, when the corporation fixes one value for the establishment of its right to a raise in fares for service, they do not fix the same value for assessment of their property for taxation. Have the public service corporations of the state been fixing one value for rates and another value for taxation? If they have they have failed to stand the supreme test of one hundred per cent Americanism.

The government under which they get their right to serve the people has ever been good to them. Many times the courts have seemed to strain the law to favor the corporations, and they have taken the criticisms of the public for such apparent corporation leanings, but if any citizen has doubt as to the question of the double standard of values of the public corporations of Nebraska in the fixing of one value for rates and an entirely different value for taxation he will have that doubt dispelled by an examination of the records of the State Railway Commission, and of the courts from the lowest court having jurisdiction to the supreme court of the United States. It is a fact that brooks no denial that in spite of the special protection public service corporations enjoy under the laws, and in spite of friendly courts, they have provoked just criticism by refusing to bear their full share of the burdens of government.

The corporations of this state have never borne their

just share of the burdens of government. Their power of hiding has been little less than supreme. The public service corporations have lost the vision of co-operation that should exist between them and the people they serve. In their autocratic demands they have forgotten that the people have rights that should ever be respected if they can hope for friendly patronage. They have forgotten that even the serpent may turn and avenge itself of the wrongs that superior power inflicts. Indeed, the serpent has already turned, and the traction companies of the entire country are pleading for sympathy. The raise in rates only opens the old wounds, and reminds the patron of autocratic demands when their power seemed supreme. We may charge it to the automobile, but in fact at least a part of the strained condition in these times of trouble can safely be charged to the reaction against a power that would not remember until his "ox" was being gored to extermination.

A new rule of assessment must be applied to the public service corporations of the state and nation, and that rule must compel the valuation of the company's holdings at the same value for assessment as that claimed for the fixing of rates for service.

Too little attention has been given to the valuation of the corporation properties of the state. The incorporated stock companies of the state and nation have invited and winked at crime. Their plans of organization have in many instances been nothing less than legalized crime. The public spirit and patriotism of the people have been appealed to for aid in the organization of large enterprises only to pave the way through which the unwary and trustful might be looted of their hard earned money. Through intricate schemes of organization and through manipulation of first preferred stock,

second preferred stock, and then common stock, all in a jumble in one organization, the means has been provided of misleading the innocent public, simply to aid in the manipulation of dividend earnings, and finally to loot them of their original investment.

A law must be passed protecting the people from the injustice and wrong that comes of these manipulations of stock issues in the corporations that are being organized for the transaction of the business that necessitates more capital than an ordinary individual can supply. There can be no excuse for the issuance of more than one kind of stock in a corporation that seeks to do a legitimate business. Too many times the people have been deceived by the several issues of stock under high sounding names, and too many times these issues have been made for the purpose of deceiving the innocent investor, and finally looting him of hard earned money.

Every corporation should be compelled to keep on file with the proper authorities of the state a complete list of every dollar issued in stock and the owner of such stock, and then every dollar of the stock in every company doing business under the laws of the state should be assessed and the taxes paid by the company, and then it should be deducted from the dividends to be paid to the owners of the stock. Such a law would be a protection to the state as well as the investors, and it would prevent the deception that has so often been practiced for the purpose of looting an innocent public.

The people have too little understood the intricacies of corporation management, with their power to mislead and deceive through their varied stock issues.

Because these things have been true, tax-dodging, and one subterfuge after another for shifting tax burdens, have reduced the assessable property of the country un-

til the burdens upon the people who will not shift those burdens amounts to confiscation. No government has a right to levy confiscatory taxes. There could be no more fruitful cause of revolution. It has been the cause of more complaint and more unpunished crime than every other cause combined.

The problem of a just system of revenue is at this time indeed the "Nation's Dance of Death." A righteous solution to the problem must be found. That solution must convert every tax-dodger into a good citizen. It must break the power of that combination of money lenders that so successfully promoted the passage of the law exempting real estate mortgages from taxation. The word "tax-free" must never again be written into the laws of any state of the Union. Twenty-seven billion dollars of tax-free securities in this nation is a special privilege that is dangerous to a free people in these days when the ledger balances show such a large per cent of the nation's wealth already in the ownership of so few of its citizens.

I well know my readers are asking the question, Can a law be passed that will remedy these things and compel the assessment of all the property within a given jurisdiction? Such a law can and must be passed, but organized capital is so powerful, and its demands are so urgent, that it will take nothing less than a supreme remedy or effort. It is easy to cry out against unjust taxation, but when a remedy is offered the cry of the right of government to interfere with the assumed rights of certain classes of the people will be questioned with vigor. Can we make the people understand the seriousness of this problem? Can they be made to understand the dangers of delay? Will the organized capital of the country willingly submit to a law sufficiently drastic

to bring the desired results? When we attempt to restore the tax-free securities to the assessor's schedules will the beneficiaries of that special privilege submit without a murmur? Neither the farmers nor the laborers of the nation have been guilty of tax-dodging, for the little property they possess is ever in the sight of the assessor. Somehow every taxpayer of this nation must be made to understand that the day has come and the necessity as well when no citizen and no class of citizens can unload from his shoulders to the shoulders of another class the burden of government without protest.

For fifty years the question of a righteous revenue law has agitated the people. Every legislature in the nation has been besieged for relief without avail. The petitions of the people have gone unheeded, but the day for a remedy must be found without delay.

The Remedy

The basic principle of any righteous revenue law is based upon that well-established doctrine that "A citizen has no right to protection of government until he has done his whole duty in the support of government."

A citizen has not done his whole duty in the support of government until every dollar of his property has been returned for assessment and he has either paved the way to pay, or paid, his share of the taxes for the support of that government.

It must be made the duty of every citizen to remove that obligation without being hunted down by an assessor and beseeched to return his property for assessment.

Up to this time we have placed upon the citizen no obligation to return his property to the assessor, but we have made it the duty of the assessor to hunt the citizen and secure the assessment of his property.

A Personal Responsibility Registration

In every city of the nation the citizen must qualify himself for citizenship, and the right to vote, by registering his qualifications before the proper authorities. Is there any good reason why a law should not be passed requiring every citizen to register his qualifications to cast his vote at the election, and on the same date every year to return his schedule of assessment? Such a law shifts the responsibility of assessment from the state to the shoulders of the citizen. A faithful co-operation with the government in the return of one's property for assessment would be a badge of honor upon the head of every man who would in good faith comply with this simple duty by placing his cards upon the table face up.

I said "qualify himself for citizenship," and I want it understood that this must mean that and nothing less. No man or woman should be permitted to vote or otherwise exercise the rights of citizenship until he or she had qualified himself for citizenship by the payment of taxes for the support of the government and that qualification must come on the solicitation of the citizen and not the government.

Every year the county assessor would furnish every citizen through the mail or in person at his office a blank schedule for the return of a complete inventory of his property. This schedule would be the clearest questionaire possible, providing for a complete description of every article in every class of property, and the law would provide that the schedule must be returned to the assessor in person within given and fixed dates. This schedule must provide every citizen a complete registration and the right to vote at the elections shall rest upon that registration the same as it rests at this time upon his registration in the city.

All property of every description must be returned and must pay tax at its reasonable cash value. The value placed upon all property, both personal and real, shall for all purposes of fixing a just legal rental rate and for all judicial purposes, be taken as the cash value of the property.

Upon complaint in writing that any citizen has failed to comply with the law as to registration and the return of his schedule as provided by law, or upon the complaint that any citizen has undervalued or overvalued his property for assessment or has neglected or refused to assess his property as provided by law, a summons would be issued by the county assessor citing the said party to appear before himself or before the county judge or any justice of the peace within his precinct to answer the complaint, which trial and other proceedings shall in all respects comply with the summons, service and trial in the justice jurisdiction in any case at law. Upon proof of any allegation in the complaint the assessor or court shall make a finding of the facts and render judgment thereon in the same manner as a judgment is rendered in a case at law.

If in any trial as above stated the court shall find that the defendant has been guilty of withholding from assessment any property that should have been assessed, for the first offense the judgment shall be for assessment of the property so withheld, and the payment of all the costs of the trial. Upon the second offense for failure to return any property for assessment, which offense shall be construed to be complete when judgment is rendered against the defendant, the judgment shall be for the sale of the property described in the complaint and found to have been withheld and the proceeds, after paying the costs, shall be deposited with the county

treasurer to the credit of the general fund of the county. The said sale to be made at public auction in the same manner and upon the same notice as is required at this time for the sale in the foreclosure of chattel mortgages.

This is legal confiscation. It is made "legal" simply as the just penalty for refusal to qualify as a citizen while claiming the protection of a citizen. The remedy may seem drastic, but when we consider that it can only be inflicted on the second offense, few would object.

Such a law as this would place upon the assessor's schedule double the property that at this time finds its way to that honored place. It would place nearly every dollars worth of property upon the tax list and make it do its duty toward the support of government.

It would unload from the backs of the farmers and middle classes one-half of the burden that is today being borne by them.

It would forever settle the question of rent profiteering, because the values that would form the basis of rentals would be the same as the values upon which the tax was levied and paid.

Such a law would necessitate no constitutional changes and could be rendered effective the year it was enacted and signed by the governor.

Under this law every citizen would feel that he owed to his state and to the nation as well the patriotic duty of qualifying himself for citizenship, first by the payment of his just proportion of the tax, and second, by registering his qualification for citizenship and keeping that qualification complete by renewing his registration when he moved his residence.

Then the last, but not the least, value that would attach to this system of registration would accrue after every state in the Union had adopted the system and

paved the way for the finding of the amount every man would owe to the government as an income tax. Few people have yet come to understand the complexity and the expense of collecting that just tax.

No nation can ever be qualified to make intelligent laws until it has by some authority put itself in a position to know by an annual accounting its exact assets and liabilities. This law is the nation's opportunity for such an accounting, and it will be every state's opportunity for the same reason.

When such a law is enacted in every state in the Union there will be no excuse for the complaints that have shamed this nation since its very birth about tax-dodging.

I will not need to call attention to the method of procedure to bring about this very desirable result. Every candidate for the legislature must be pledged to the enactment of such a law before he can hope for the support of the voters who believe in the law. The state is the first unit from which must radiate the fight for this reform, and the slogan for the campaign must be, "There Is No Room in America for Tax-Dodging."

A Belated Testimony*

Since writing the above chapter on "The Nation's Dance of Death," the Nebraska Legislature has vindicated my statement that there was a growing tendency in the nation to exempt from taxation all properties known as money and securities. This tendency has been in process of development for several years, but when my chapter was completed it had not occurred to me that in these strenuous days of over-high taxes that any

*To our readers outside of Nebraska: The above addition to our chapter on "The Nation's Dance of Death" was written especially for the people of Nebraska. If it shall aid the people of other states in perfecting a reform of their revenue laws we shall be content.—The author.

man would have it in his heart to lay upon the already over-burdened taxpayers a heavier burden than they had already been obliged to bear.

I am writing these additional words to let the people of Nebraska know just what its legislature has done, as well as to speak a word of warning to the other states of the Union that they may profit by Nebraska's misfortune.

For more than forty years the people have complained of unequal and unjust taxation. The distrust of our system of assessment has become so general, and the tax burdens have mounted to such unexplainable proportions, that the people with one accord are crying out for relief. It has been indeed "The Nation's Dance of Death."

The money of Nebraska has never found its way to the assessor's schedule. At this time more than $600,000,000 is sitting back in its seclusion, reaping a harvest of interest, enjoying the protection of our courts, and laughing at the law. Promises for future payment of money in the shape of secured and unsecured notes amounting to more than $700,000,000 are dead to any responsibility in sharing the burdens of government. Ten counties of the state possess more merchandise than has ever been assessed in the entire state. The great corporations of the state, with their millions of dollars of dividend-bearing stocks are paying almost no taxes at all. There are more dollars of live judgments on the dockets of one of the justice courts of Lancaster county than were ever assessed in the entire state, in spite of the fact that the judgments of the state amount to several million dollars. Nearly $500,000,000 of real estate mortgages have already been exempt from taxation in Nebraska, and the money so exempt in the United States reaches the enormous sum of $27,000,000,000.

The constitutional provision under which a new revenue law was enacted in the last session of our legislature is here given that the reader may know just what is the constitutional authority upon which the new law is based.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Section 1. The necessary revenue of the state, and its governmental subdivisions, shall be raised by taxation in such a manner as the Legislature may direct, but taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all tangible property and franchises and taxes uniform as to class may be levied by valuation upon all other property. Taxes, other than property taxes, may be authorized by law. Existing revenue laws shall continue in effect until changed by the legislature.

Section 2. The property of the state and its governmental subdivisions shall be exempt from taxation. The legislature by general law may exempt property owned by and used exclusively for agricultural and horticultural societies, and property owned and used exclusively for educational, religious, charitable or cemetery purposes, when such property is not owned or used for financial gain or profit to either owner or user. Household goods of the value of two hundred ($200) dollars to each family shall be exempt from taxation. The legislature by general law may provide that the increased value of land by reason of shade or ornamental trees planted along the highway shall not be taken into account in the assessment of such land. No property shall be exempt from taxation except as provided in this section.

Under the legislative interpretation of these sections of the constitution a law was passed providing for the

assessment of all money, notes, bills of exchange, certificates of deposit in banks, trust companies, and all such properties under class one under the interpretation that these properties are intangible, and will pay tax on 25 per cent of its assessed valuation.

Under class two of intangible property all bonds of the state, counties, townships, cities, villages, school districts and irrigation and drainage districts are assessed and taxed at one-tenth of one per cent of their actual value, or 10 cents on every $100.

I challenge the interpretation of the constitution that calls these properties "intangible". Webster says: "A thing is tangible when it is perceptible to the touch, or capable of being possessed or realized." Under this definition would you say that money is intangible? Is money not perceptible to the touch and capable of being possessed or realized? Would not the same be true as to the other classes noted under class one? If they are perceptible to the touch they are tangible and should be assessed as such, and under that interpretation the constitutionality of the law is questioned.

I do not want to seem harsh or over-critical, but I believe this interpretation of the constitution is a deliberate and a premeditated excuse for the exemption of over a billion dollars worth of the property of the state on a false definition of the meaning of the words "tangible and intangible".

But let us suppose that these definitions are right, and that every dollar of these classes of property are assessed at the rates authorized by law, then seventy-five per cent of the property found in the state in class one is exempt, and in the second class nearly every dollar is exempt.

Farmers and owners of city real estate in Nebraska,

here is the problem as you will find it when you pay your taxes. If your farm is worth $20,000 you must pay tax upon that value. The same is true of city real estate. If your $20,000 is cash, certificates of deposit or secured notes, it will be assessed at just $5,000, and the other $15,000 will be exempt. If your $20,000 is invested in interest-bearing county, state, school district, city, village or irrigation bonds you will be taxed under the new law on the $20,000 so invested just $16.

This is an awful story. Instead of a revision of the revenue laws of the state, we have been cursed by a law of exemption. Already overburdened by taxes and low prices, the people needed more tax money instead of more tax-drones and tax-dodgers.

This law must be repealed. It is legalized exemption of seventy-five cents out of every dollar of the best property man can own, and it is legalized exemption of practically every dollar of every form of commercial paper.

Exemption of private property from taxation is legalized crime.

They tell us that the owners of these properties refuse to assess them. I admit that little of this class of property has ever found its way to the assessor's schedule, but will this fact excuse the passage of a law of exemption? Will exemption relieve the tax-burdened people of the state? Must the law-abiding people of Nebraska acknowledge that our law, and the power to make and enforce laws, are impotent? Are they impotent just when they must be applied to men of means?

There is a remedy. Every dollar that enjoys the protection of our courts must pay its full share of the burden of government.

The remedy is in your own hands. Will you apply it?

Chapter VI

GOVERNMENT BY PARTY

In the campaign eight years after the birth of this republic two great principles divided the people. Alexander Hamilton led the forces of the Federalists and stood for a strong central government, and Thomas Jefferson led the forces of the Republicans and firmly advocated a government in which supreme confidence was reposed in the people. He was elected the second president of the republic on a promise of opposition to monarchy, preservation of the rights of the states, freedom of religion, free speech, free commerce, and internal defense.

This campaign was the beginning of government by party. Mr. Jefferson's election was an endorsement of the principles for which he stood, and those principles were in fact the first political platform that was ever enunciated by any party.

These were the formative days of the republic. Great principles were everything. Men were simply the means through which government must function. No patriot had ever thought of the spoils of office, for there were no spoils. The republic had indeed been born. Its swaddling clothes had been discarded, but the spirit of autocracy was not yet dead. These conspiracies of parties immediately began to hinder the administration, and for a time it seemed that government by a ruling class was inevitable.

Washington, becoming alarmed, in his farewell address, raised his voice in warning against the dangers of the partisan spirit. He said, "The party spirit always

distracts the public councils, and enfeebles the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies, of one party against the other. It is a fire not to be quenched. It demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into flame, lest instead of warning it should consume."

For many years after this first great struggle for party supremacy political parties were not so active, indeed the dwellers in the thirteen colonies were homogeneous, but in their infancy, and youth, and even in their middle age, the party spirit did not dominate the policies of the nation, but in the days preceding the civil war Washington's warning was more than realized in those anxious days of compromise, but it was not until the nation was in the very throes of revolution that the people came to understand the real dangers that threatened the republic through the partisan spirit.

The partisan spirit again runs high. Government by party has come to mean nothing more than the "ins and the outs". Party platforms have come to mean nothing. Expediency writes them, and they are either endorsed or rejected without opportunity for study. The political press of the nation, with a power that has never been rightly understood, aided by men trained in all the arts of propaganda, are scattered broadcast over the land to shape the political opinions of the people. No man can measure the influence that is behind these powerful agencies, in their power to shape the policies of the political parties, and the opinions of the people.

Partisanship has no conscience. It stands for anything to win. It aids in the building of machines for the advancement of men who represent great corporations, instead of the people. It pays political debts by the appointment of untrained or incompetent subordi-

nates, and boasts that the spoils of office belong to the victors. It defeats wholesome legislation wholly because it originated in the mind of a member of the opposite party. In this atmosphere of prejudice and misrepresentation our boys and girls, the men and women of the next generation, are getting their first lessons in government, while christian men and women are standing aloof from participation in party politics because of the vile odors of graft, and bossism, and misrepresentation that so truthfully belong to partisan politics.

Political parties have failed to function. The nomination and election of a president has come to be a national disgrace. The "We demands" that are urged before a national convention lose sight of the people and are urged to give votes to the party endorsing them.

These questions should engross the mind of every thinking American who wants to see his government function efficiently.

Are political parties necessary to a republican form of government? Do they aid the people to qualify themselves for intelligent voting? Can we hope to secure the services of the best qualified men for office through the functioning of our present day political system? Have the dominant political parties aided or hindered the people in securing the great reforms that have engrossed the mind of the people for the last half century?

I want to answer the last question, but before answering it, I want to challenge the great men of both old parties, the men who have helped to write the history of this nation for the last half century, to point to a single great moral reform that has been written into law in that time, upon which either of those dominant parties has ever spoken a word in its national platform either for or against.

For a century this nation had been shaken to its very foundation by that great moral question of the right of one human being to own and hold another human being in slavery, and the right to buy and sell him as cattle and hogs are sold. Political compromises stood in the way of the settlement of the real questions at issue until such men as Wendell Phillips, Garrison, and Lovejoy, and such women as Harriet Beecher Stowe cried out, "Human slavery is a crime against God, and it must be abolished." In sunny southland the brightest and best of America's young manhood was sacrificed upon the altar of this nation to pay the penalty of a political compromise upon a principle of right by allowing the slaveholders in the territory already holding slaves to continue to hold, and to sell them as in the past, and refusing to allow it to be extended into new territory.

In the great campaign for president in which Lincoln was elected the conflict raged around the question of state's rights instead of dealing fearlessly with the real question of any man's right to own and hold a human being in bondage.

After the election, Mr. Lincoln in his first inaugural address said: "I have no purpose either directly or indirectly to interfere with the institutions of slavery. I have no right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Had it been possible to present this question directly to the people in its real meaning, without the bickerings that go with our system of government by party, the civil war might have been settled with a pen instead of the sword.

It must be written as a fact of history that it took a hundred years of compromise, and bitterness, and bickerings to break the shackles that bound the limbs of four million black slaves, and to write into the constitution

of this nation that the right of property in human flesh is forever prohibited. Rivers of blood, millions of money and treasure, a century of bitter strife and hatred, because the political parties of this nation had not the moral courage to speak out fearlessly upon this greatest question of the century.

Again I challenge the system of government by party, and this time I call the mothers of the nation to witness that neither of the dominant parties of the nation could ever be induced to cry out against that legalized monster of iniquity, the saloon. For a hundred years the purest of American manhood and womanhood pleaded the cause of a saloonless nation and urged the political parties to aid in its destruction, but their pleas were never heard. Refusal was the rankest cowardice. It took a hundred years of agitation, and sacrifice, and argument, and then finally the argument of commercial waste in time of a great war, to awaken the conscience of the politicians of this nation, and get them to speak upon this vital national disgrace. I assert that every home that was ruined, every crime that was committed, every tear that was shed as the result of strong drink, and the open saloon, was the direct result of, and is chargeable to, the *cowardice* and *inefficiency* of government by party.

But I want the women of the nation to stand again as witnesses upon the cowardice of political parties. Since the birth of the republic they have been pleading the cause of equal suffrage in vain. We fought the revolutionary war because we said "Taxation without representation is tyranny." The women pleaded that they were being taxed without the right to speak in the making of the laws, and that if taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776 it has been tyranny ever

since, but in this great question of right it took a hundred years of cowardice, and then again a world war, to submit to the states the right to vote upon this great question. We cannot resist the temptation to call attention to the supreme bravery of the political parties in those last solicitous days of the campaign, when the ratification of the proposed amendment for suffrage was in the balance, how both parties tried to convince the women of this nation that they and their party were the staunch friends of the women and their right to suffrage.

I am not done yet, for I want to call the political parties once again to answer for their shortcomings through their beautiful system of government by party. Since the very beginning of this government the obligation of electing men to represent the states in the greatest legislative body on earth was by our constitution placed upon the legislatures of the several states. The story of election of United States senators furnishes the most disgraceful chapter in our history. A campaign in which a senator was to be elected began with the nomination of men for a seat in the legislature, and frequently the campaign did not end until the disgraceful struggle had occupied an entire session. In these campaigns men stood for election who were known as the pliant tools of railroads and other great corporation interests. Candidates for representatives were pledged to the support of a program outlined by the great corporations and to candidates for the senate who were the tools of those corporations. They were without shame in their disgraceful fight, and in the spending of money. It was common knowledge that money flowed freely in such campaigns and the men who were elected to represent the people were in fact the representatives of great monied interests whose hearts never once beat in sym-

pathy with the great struggling masses of the people. Pre-election campaigns were charged and surcharged with the vilest political abuse, and the all-engrossing purpose of the candidate was to find favor with the candidate for the senate who had the biggest barrel. Special interest election of the United States senators was the rule of the politics of those days and from that time until the disgraceful seating of the late famous Senator Newbury of Michigan by the Senate of the United States, and later by a partisan vote in the senate, political corruption has disgraced the system of government by party, while the duly elected senators have dishonored their seats in that great body.

Did the great political parties ever speak for the correction of this abuse of the principles of a free people? They never did, and that question was not settled until a great protest party placed the vileness of that system of election before the people with such emphasis as to compel the men whose seats were dishonored to act for the security of their own political lives. Failure to bring this disgraceful system of electing men to represent us in the senate of the United States to a vote of the people for more than a century must be charged directly to our cowardly and inefficient system of government by party and every act and vote of those men is directly chargeable to that system, for the people all the time knew the system was wrong and would have stamped it out a hundred years ago if they could have had the opportunity.

I now approach a subject that has been brought to the attention of every thoughtful American in the last fifty years with special force. The indictments already recorded against government by party have been serious indeed, but when we remember that this nation has

three times within the last half century been called to mourn the loss of a chief executive by the assassin's bullet, thoughtful men are beginning to ask the reason. Must it be said of this nation of freemen that the finished product of our civilization must find its remedies for the wrongs of government in the assassin's bullet? In the name of the American people I protest even such an insinuation. While we must admit the awful crimes that bowed our heads in grief, we deny that in either instance the incentive to commit the atrocious crime was a reflection of the spirit of the institutions of our great government. It must be recorded that in each instance we were called to mourn as a result of the failure of our system of government by party to settle the great questions by applying the remedy of reason, instead of permitting political parties to thwart the will of the people by political cowardice in dealing with the moral and political questions that must be dealt with through the processes of the law.

Americans! We must awake before it is too late. The "We demands" of the special interests of this intensely political generation bodes no good for the people. Demands for new laws should come from the people after they have had opportunity for investigation and then the problem must be presented to the electorate through the forum and a people's press.

Partisan prejudice is an unsafe guide in these days when it seems that this is the governing force in the world. The greatest danger that America ever faced since the earliest days of the republic is the danger that an ultra partisanship fastens upon a free people. We have been pleased to call ourselves a Christian nation, but our political system of government by party, with its prejudices, and spoils, precludes the application of

the commonest principles of the Christian doctrines as they were taught by the Christ. Under that system the people have no means of studying great questions without prejudice, and they have no teachers except those who are already unfitted by a life of education in the school of political prejudice and political spoils. Under that system law fails to keep pace with the evolution of business. The men whom we elect to represent us in our congress are expected by their party constituents to return to the people whom they represent a full share of the congressional loot, known as the political spoils, and at least a part of the contents of "The Pork Barrel". We have come to estimate their ability by their power to deliver these things, instead of by the measure of constructive statesmanship. The first year of every presidential administration is largely devoted to a division of the spoils of office, and the most effective argument for the political policies that are advocated is the welfare of the party, instead of the good of the people.

The man who depends on the party label to guide him in voting is not worthy a seat in any legislative hall. If the people want intelligent voting, either at the ballot box or in the halls of the legislature or congress, they must abolish the party label and in some way force the men who represent them to vote on principle, and to do some real thinking on their own account, and then show sufficient manhood to express the convictions that come to them as a result of that thinking in an unprejudiced, non-political vote upon every question presented to them.

So common is the practice of appealing to the party to stand for "party loyalty" instead of a principle, that someone has asked the question, "Why a legislature?" The man who propounded the question answered it as

follows: "Take a hundred and thirty men from all walks of life. Give seventy-five per cent of them a seventh grade education, fifteen per cent a college education, and let the balance struggle up from the third grade to the high school. Now round them up in a strange town under conditions they have not seen before, under strange influences, all strangers to each other. Then put them in two rooms called a house and a senate, organize them into committees and in the back of the head of each one inject a mean, sneaking ambition to hold a state job and move to town. Then, Bang! Slap down on them from the outside a hundred questions on statesmanship and laws they never heard of before, things involving millions of dollars and the good fortune of a million people. Then on the top of all this give them just sixty days in which to solve these questions. It is nonsense to expect good results. It is a guarantee of misgovernment. It may have worked in another generation, but it will not work in this. Such a scheme was devised for another age."

Our government is a republic. It is supposed to derive all its just powers from the consent of the governed, the people. These powers are administered through representatives. Our constitution fixed the three branches of government, each with its separate function, and each clothed with its specific authority. These separate branches of government are known as the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The legislative to make the laws, the executive to administer them, and the judiciary to interpret them.

The making of that constitution was the most stupendous task that was ever undertaken by any generation of men. It excited the admiration of the whole civilized world. It laid the broadest foundation for representative government that had yet been laid.

Our first lessons in representative government were learned in England, because that was the mother country, and was the nearest type of a democracy. With a new vision of statesmanship our forefathers worked this government out on a scale and with a magnitude that is without parallel in human history.

Since we received our first lessons from England, no one is surprised that the arrangement of our legislative machinery is one of the things that most nearly copies the English system. The House of Lords corresponding to our Senate, and the House of Commons corresponding to our House of Representatives.

The American people have come to know that there are dangers lurking in our English system of law making. They know that the arguments that were made when we adopted it are the very arguments that after nearly two centuries are being used against it.

There is perhaps no function of government that calls for so much statesmanship, so much patriotism, and so much "horse sense" as the function of law making. Law making is creative. Someone must blaze the way before the world can follow. At the time our constitution was in making the way in our republic had not been blazed. Someone has said that "History is philosophy teaching by example," but history and philosophy alike failed to offer suggestions to our forefathers. Out of the necessities of their new conditions our forefathers were obliged to work out the problems for themselves.

In view of these facts will anyone wonder that they made mistakes and that in these days of evolution in every affair of government and business there has been necessity for change? We have changed the old constitution that was framed with such wonderful wisdom, nineteen times, and it must be changed again, perhaps

many times. Will anyone who reads these pages say that that constitution is too sacred to suffer amendment? The people well know that in the evolution of the social order, *nothing is written* with more definiteness than the laws of change. Changed conditions in every walk of life necessitates new laws to meet the demands of these changes.

A hundred and fifty years of crucial test in the fire of political conflict has taught the people that our legislative machinery, and its application by the political parties, has failed, and is certain to continue to fail in these days of complex government and economic changes. We indeed have a representative government, but that government is so slow and so cumbersome, under the machinery of political adjustments, that the onward march of industrial progress is a half century ahead of the law-making power. While our congress quibbles over minor matters for political advantage, the commercial interests, with their well-tried schemes of corporation organization for commercial and industrial achievements, are far ahead of the possibility of intelligent regulation. Political expediency has so retarded the legislative machinery in its action that in state and nation alike we have witnessed the failure of our law makers to answer the popular demands for new laws so urgently needed. Do we not have the evidence every week that our law makers either pass or defeat legislation wholly without other consideration than the consideration of party loyalty? The majority party will refuse consideration of much needed measures simply because they originated in the opposite party. To remedy these things our representatives must be made responsive to the people. They must come to know that they must return to the people. not industry alone, but their best judgment.

Where lies the fault? What is the remedy? The fault is easily found, for every intelligent American can put his finger on it without erring.

I have said that when our constitution makers permitted two houses in the legislative body they copied the law-making body of aristocratic England. I well know the arguments that are so ably advanced for the continuance of that system, but I have never heard a single argument that appealed to me as being founded upon sound reasoning for a bicameral legislative body. Why two houses in a legislative body? In congress, as well as in every legislative body in the states, it must be recorded that more legislation, and more important legislation, has been defeated by jealousies alone than many times have been passed. The bicameral legislature simply doubles the possibility of wrong.

A Unicameral Legislature

The first step that must be taken to restore this government to the people is the destruction of the bicameral legislative system of law making in every state as well as in our congress, and in its place establish by constitutional provision the unicameral system and reducing the single house about one-half. The one smaller body laboring under no handicap of political bossism would pass more and better considered laws in thirty days than a bicameral legislature would pass in sixty days. This step must be accomplished before the nation can hope for the beginning of the solution of the other problems that must be solved before the people can realize a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

To accomplish this first step is a simple thing in government. Without any other machinery than the ballot men can be elected who are pledged to vote and work

for an amendment to the constitution providing for a unicameral legislative body, and when the people have studied the cumbersome system that has prevailed for nearly two centuries they will be enthusiastic for the change.

Do the people realize with what levity our legislators are considering and passing upon important issues in this country? Do they realize how many measures are being considered without discussion? What this nation needs is an unbiased study and discussion of every state and national question of government, from the specific application of the fundamental principle to the practical application of the principle to the law. We must adopt some constructive policy that accepts economic facts as they are, and instead of trying to rebut, refute and disable, we must harness them in the public interest and make them our servants.

The object of education is citizenship, and a proper preparation for it. Citizenship in this republic at this time is desperately practical. We never stood in as grave need of a practical study of the needs of this nation as we do at this time. The nation was never in as receptive a political mood as it is at this time. We have too long left the shaping of our national policies, and the making of our laws, to those who represented special interests instead of the people. We must insist that the rights of citizenship in a republic place upon the possessor of those rights corresponding responsibilities and duties. The problems that confront us at this time are so vital to the very existence of the republic that we must adjust the machinery of government to suit the tasks to be performed, and to do this we must make a problem solving campaign such as this nation never saw.

The beginning of that problem-solving campaign must give promise that it will restore the government to the people. It has not been a government of the people since it became a government by party.

Can this be done? Let the answer to this question be weighed carefully, for that answer is to point the way to the beginning of a new era in state and national law-making alike.

No reform can hope to gain favor with a thoughtful people that tears down the old structure before it has the machinery for a new structure to take its place. The bicameral system of legislation has failed. It has failed because it has never been able to consider the laws that were needed before it began the stupendous task of writing new laws to take the place of the old laws that were to be discarded. It has failed because it has depended upon men to make the laws who, before their election, were bound hand and foot to a political party with an explicit—or an implied—promise of party loyalty. The whole machinery of bicameral legislation is organized with the express purpose of passing the laws that the party in power suggests. Government by party recognizes no authority but the party in power. A christian democracy recognizes no authority but the authority of the people with their right to advise. Behind a christian democracy will ever stand that great army of men and women, ready and with the machinery to express their disapproval, and give their advice on any measure that is being considered, but it must be understood that such advice would seldom be needed, for only on a very few measures would there be serious difference of opinion when political considerations were eliminated.

The basic principle of a christian democracy is a well-

grounded belief in majority rule. No political prejudices would ever stand in the way of a vote for the best qualified men to do the work demanded. Once elected, the legislator would be under promise to obey the mandates of the people, and in the absence of such a mandate his judgment would be supreme.

Mandates from the people would be rare under a christian democracy, for the legislators would have only one purpose, and that purpose would be to serve the people with the best judgment they could command.

I want to repeat for emphasis that the first step to be taken in the building of a christian democracy must be the election of a legislature pledged to the submission of an amendment to the constitution of each state providing for a unicameral legislative body. When this is accomplished the work of building the machinery of law-making would be simple.

For a quarter of a century we have talked and legislated on the question of the initiative, referendum and recall. Every line that has been written and every law that has been passed has recognized the need for a provision through which a nation might speak upon the laws that are passed as well as upon laws that the people want. Anything less than the power to speak takes from the people the power that must belong to them in a republic. Laws have been passed in many of the states of the Union denominated initiative and referendum laws, but in every state they have been so cumbersome, so expensive and so slow that they have seldom been invoked for the relief of the people except in instances of the most urgent need, yet every law that has ever been referred to the people has been a positive demonstration that the judgment of the people at the ballot-box is well nigh infallible.

A republic without the machinery of *initiating* and *referring* laws to the people is absolutely impotent for its own protection. When political prejudice and party regularity are eliminated, few measures to be considered would divide any law-making body, but when political axes are to be ground and political regularity is to be considered, here lies the danger.

The same machinery that will be used in the state, and in every political subdivision of the state, will be the machinery for a national referendum. In a description, which must be very brief, we will try to make plain the machinery for a national referendum, and its application to the states and their political subdivisions.

A National Referendum

Every voting precinct in the United States would comprise a referendum district, and some central point in the precinct would be made a community center.

In every referendum district a man or woman would be elected by the people in the district, and would serve under the title "Referendum Commissioner".

The referendum commissioner would have charge of all public meetings, receive and advertise all questions for public consideration and discussion, preside at all community meetings, and with the aid of two other persons have charge of all referendum elections and petitions or referendum votes.

The president of the United States, upon a proper petition from the several states, would submit the question proposed to the governor, who would immediately refer the same to every referendum commissioner. The call of the president would state the question for consideration, fix the dates between which the votes would be cast, and the votes when cast would be sent to the

clerk of the county, who would immediately forward them to the secretary of state to be tabulated and forwarded to the president.

On questions of great urgency the vote could be taken within thirty days of the date of notification by the president, but on questions of less urgency the date of voting might be fixed three or six months ahead, thus giving ample time for study of the question and for public discussion in the community centers, and wherever the public might want to call meetings.

Think of it! The mind of an entire nation centered upon a great question at the same time, and studying that question without a single purpose but to ascertain the vital truths as they relate to the mandate of a great people upon the question at issue. This would constitute the greatest problem-solving campaign that was ever set in motion in any nation on earth. Every school house and every church in the nation would open its doors to this greatest school that has ever devoted itself to the solution of the problems of the state. In those schools there would be no politicians. Not a single man would have a political ax to grind, but with the teachers, ministers, lawyers, merchants and laborers of the nation, the fundamental facts that relate to the question at issue would be discussed in a spirit of perfect cordiality and friendliness before the nation gave its verdict, and when that verdict was given the world would know the mind of this great nation. A great question has been considered. A verdict has been rendered. It has been recorded in the national capitol. Our law makers know the mind of the people of this nation whom they were elected to serve.

Would they obey that mandate, They would. For behind the mandate would be that weapon, the recall,

which could be invoked just as easily and with the same machinery as the referendum.

Let us suppose that when our president sent the treaty of Versailles to the senate for ratification such a referendum could have been taken. Is there a man in America who believes that the verdict of the people would have been for a refusal to ratify that treaty and League of Nations?

But whether they refused or rejected it, is there a man or woman who is not willing to submit to the verdict of the majority, if that majority expressed the unbiased opinion of a great people after giving time, and having opportunity for a study of the question with the splendid opportunities such a school as we have outlined would give for knowing the facts as they relate to the question at issue?

Let us again view the possibilities of such a referendum. Only a few months ago this nation was disgraced by a fistic combat to exhibit to the world the power of brute force. Millions of dollars were worse than wasted under the pleas that American manhood was represented in that exhibition of power, that in nearly every city and state of the union had been prohibited by law. Innocent boys in every city of the land were driven into an enthusiasm for America's champion by fascinating stories in the daily papers, and that enthusiasm was goaded on by the hope of financial gain through the sale of their "extras" after the fight had been decided. Could we get our congress to take action upon this question? You say no. Why not? A law could be passed within thirty days if there was no handicap, but the politicians would hesitate because no political party in its national convention had spoken against such exhibitions. If the question of a national prohibition of

prize fighting were submitted in such a referendum as we have outlined would this nation not demand of our law makers in a mandate that would be heard and heeded from the lakes to the gulf and from the Pacific to the Atlantic that prize fighting in America shall be prohibited forever? In such a mandate America would speak in no uncertain language, but our congress under a system of government by party would find time for such legislation only, after a generation of agitation, if at all. But the people in this court of last resort would need only a day to render an emphatic verdict and remove the possibility of a repetition of such a national disgrace as we have been obliged to apologize for within only a few months.

A Presidential Primary

The whole story is not yet told. The same machinery we have outlined for a national referendum would serve the people in the nominations of president and vice president and remove the possibility of another national disgrace such as we were obliged to apologize for in the nomination of candidates for president and vice president in the last election. The day in which there is excuse for spending a barrel of money to secure the nomination for the highest office in this nation has passed. Nothing could be more harmful, and more disgraceful, than a campaign such as we have tolerated in this country for the last half century. The prejudices that are engendered in such a contest are stiffling to the moral sense of the nation. The date for a national primary should be fixed by law. On that date the voters of the nation would deposit their votes in the same manner as the votes were deposited in the referendum just outlined on a previous page. The man who received the

highest number of votes and the man who received the largest per cent of the votes in the largest per cent of the states in the union would be the two candidates at the November election for president, and the same would be true as to candidates for vice president. Should a tie vote in either case be cast, both candidates that tied would be declared candidates for the November election and the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote of the nation would be declared elected.

In the same primary election the people would speak upon the several important national questions that would be submitted, and the mandate given by the majority of the votes would be the platform of the men nominated and elected upon the questions submitted.

Initiative and Recall

Everything that has been said in relation to the referendum as to machinery would be effective for the initiation of any measure of legislation that the people desired. At this moment a question of national importance is being urged upon our congress. It is the question of a national marriage and divorce law. I refer to this in this connection simply to emphasize the ease with which such a law might be made effective without the delays that are certain if we must depend upon political action.

Much has been said in the last twenty-five years about the recall of our public servants. We do not care to enter into a discussion of the right of recall or of the wisdom of applying that right, but it must be said that the right of recall is simply the right to rule. The same power that elects must have the power to recall in a government of the people. If a representative, either in a legislature or in congress, fails to obey the man-

dates of his constituents in the making of the laws, the people have the right, and it is their duty, to recall that servant without delay, and send men who will obey their will. Such a recall is contemplated in our plan for a referendum, and its influence, even though it might never be invoked, would be salutary.

Is further explanation needed? Such a referendum as we have outlined provides the machinery through which a nation can speak without the handicap of political prejudice. When we can eliminate the vile odors of graft, and misrepresentation, and abuse from our political system we can get every teacher from our public school, every minister of the gospel, every woman who is interested in the homes of this nation to take a part in this great school of problem solving, and then we could begin to realize what a government of the people, for the people, and by the people would mean to a really free people. The presidential primary would permit the people to name the men they wanted, instead of permitting them to be named by special groups for sinister purposes. We would then draft our public servants instead of permitting the great dailies to name a few men a year ahead, even for the less important offices and in that way arouse a sentiment for men pledged to special interests or against honorable men who can have no means of defense against such criminal offenses as are permitted at this time because by insinuation there attaches no liability under the law and the effect is more certain.

Such a campaign will eliminate the chronic self-seeker for official honors, and holding of an office when a man is called to serve the people in this manner would indeed be a *high honor.*

Think of it! The intellectual and moral forces of a

great nation, organized to speak as one man upon the vital questions of state, not from the standpoint of technical phraseology of the laws, not deciding every detail of treaty making, not dealing with the simpler questions of government directly, but with the power and the machinery for the study of the problems, and then the power to speak the voice of the wisdom so acquired in such a way as to make that voice heard in the halls of our law makers.

Under such a christian democracy there would be no place and no excuse for the red flag of anarchy. The cries of socialism would be drowned in the enthusiasm for the new democracy. The doors of opportunity would again be opened for the great armies of men and women who labor. This great christian nation would find its place at the council table of the League of Nations, and its perfect law making machinery would serve as a model for other nations of the world. The people would insist upon disarmament as provided by the League of Nations, and the battleships of this republic would give place to great merchantmen that would go scouting to every clime bearing the fruits of this nation of plenty to bless the starving peoples of other lands. This government would then be able to institute a program of home building that would mean that homes would be provided or be made possible for the millions that today are crushed under the heel of an autocracy of wealth that is galling to American freemen.

All hail America! The great toiling masses of the common people, the men and women who have been the hope of the nation, and the bulwark of American life; they who have built its cities and its railroads, fought its battles, paid its taxes, and changed its virgin soils into fertile fields, once again on the throne, and the power of political parties forever on the scaffold.

Chapter VII

COMPETITION

Political economy as a science has been the football of every decade of political evolution.

Adam Smith, only two centuries ago, revolutionized the economic thought of England and the world, and entirely altered the attitude of governments toward economic problems. He was free from many of the faults of the earlier political economists. He has been called the father of economics, and many thought that from his brain had sprung the whole of political science full grown and fully armed, but the evolutions of every generation have proved the falacy of one and another of his doctrines, until the world must now admit that the doctrines he taught only paved the way for a new era of investigation by playing havoc with old prejudices.

The mind of the whole world has ever been at enmity with innovations. It has always been slow to accept the new and to discard the old.

Political economy, whether it be expounded by Hume, Ricardo, Mills or Smith, is simply the evolution of principles of government applied to the conditions of society at a given era of human history. Economic laws are relative, not absolute.

When those old economists preached with such vehemence the doctrines of competition, they had never dreamed of the power of organization in the commercial world. When they reasoned with such logic about the principles of free trade and tariffs, they had never had a vision of a world so intimately associated commer-

cially as are the nations of the world today. When Smith wrote his wonderful book on the Wealth of Nations he had never dreamed of the ultimate relations that in this country have come to shape the destinies of the world, and so as I come to consider the question of competition I must take into account the progress of civilization, with all its changing laws of economics as they are forcing the modern solution of the many perplexing questions of this new age.

We are beginning to understand that not all that has been built by our forefathers has been right, and even in the things that have seemed right, we have drifted away from the truths that should have remained as the foundation of the great economic structure, because our premises were wrong from the beginning.

If you asked me to name some of the inequalities of man's struggle in life, I would point to the one that seemed to me to be the fountain of more real misery in the human family than all else, when I charge a large share of it to our competitive system.

From our earliest childhood we have been taught that God established the competitive system in all his creation, and that the only fair deduction possible from this well-established creation is the law of the "survival of the fittest". This theory of creation is pointed out as an argument against co-operation.

It is true that in all the material creation this doctrine seems to be the law of God. Herbiverous creation lives and thrives, only to offer its life upon the sacrificial altar of God's carniverous creation. The lion's very existence is the lamb's destruction. His ferocity is increased as his efforts to satisfy his God-given appetite are thwarted. This is his only road to life, and in the whole animal creation this law is written with the stamp

of God's approval. This is the strife of beasts, but does it follow that the law of competition should be the law of life? Are we, who have been created in the image of God, and given dominion over every living thing, destined to work out the problems of the human race on the theory that we are mere animals, and held only to account to God for lives measured by the laws laid down for the beasts of the field?

In the world of business we have been taught that competition is the life of trade, but the civilization of this century is analyzing this doctrine, and asking the question, "Is the strife of beasts as it is laid down in nature for their existence to be the law of God as to the rights of life between God's children?"

Competition has always meant that the strong won the prize and the weak lost, but this again is the strife of beasts. In it there is not an element of man's nature, except as man is originally a beast of the field.

Is there any reason why I, being physically strong, should take the prizes of life as they are given for man's existence, while my brother who is physically weak, must perish for the want of the things God has given simply because I am strong and he is weak? Over yonder is a coveted prize. It is a gift of God to mankind. Possession gives the right to ownership. Ten men flee in pursuit only to find that one, fleeter than they, had possessed the prize long before their weary feet had reached the spot. By this law of the beasts of the field the one who needed the prize least of all had won, and success to him meant failure to all the others.

God never intended that the competition of the animal kingdom should be the law of the children of men. Recognize in nature the law of competitive strife as you may, down deep in your heart you must admit that,

measured by every law of economic justice, and by every instinct of christian ethics, competition appeals to the animal, and robs man of his higher nature.

Ever since the world began the prizes of competitive strife have been the goal of life. It has bred into man's very nature the greed that the animal instinct had already made strong. This instinct for selfish gain has been handed down from parent to child until his infant mind is strong alone in its natural endowment to grasp for worldly goods.

Psychologists tell us that maternity has the power to bestow upon the offspring the predominant characteristics of the parent, and that the wonderful natural endowment of great musicians, artists and mathematicians have been the product of pre natal conditions. They also tell us that by a study of these conditions the uplift of the human family might be effected. No doubt this is at least to some extent true, and if it were, then would it be unreasonable to conclude that since from the beginning of the world the one object of man's life has been the acquisition of wealth, he has handed down from generation to generation this one all-absorbing desire, until he has made the mind stronger in this than in its other natural endowment? Have you not noted how from infancy this animal instinct seems to predominate over every other instinct of the mind? Is this instint natural? If it is, we conclude that it is, only as it typifies the natural man—the animal. Again, is this instinct developed more in the later generations of men? No doubt it is. They tell us that the power to accumulate wealth is God-given. Whether it is or not, it is a development of man's mental capacity, and strong as is this selfish desire stamped upon the human family, and necessary as it has been to his very existence, we can

only wonder that it is not stronger rather than weaker than it is.

Individualists tell us that competition is necessary to a healthy development of man's mind, and that without competition the world would soon become a mass of sluggards, without energy and thrift. Let us see. Does competition ever effect the farmer as he produces his crop? He sows in the springtime, he fights the battles against his natural enemies during the summer, and in the autumn he gathers his crop, without in the least way coming into competition with his neighbor. From the hand of God to the lap of man, the only strife, the only struggle is between man and his natural enemies, thorns, thistles, weeds, frost, hail and drought. When he has met and overcome all these enemies the bounty of God is measured by His inexorable laws of nature. Competition has no place in God's economics, except as God's creatures in the native wild prey upon one another for their very life.

Where then does competition originate as it applies to human affairs? It originates with the birth of trade and sale for profit. Its evil influences were not felt in the world of commercial transactions until a large part of the property was individually owned. Competition as it exists in the commercial world is not a creation of God, but a creation of the evil one, and when the world comes into its own, when it has written into the laws of the land and into the lives of the people the answer to that question that has come ringing down through all the generations of men to the present time, that question that has never been answered in ethic, or in church relations, or in the law, "Am I my brother's keeper"? then indeed may we hope that the righteousness of God will be established among men.

What does competition mean in business? It means that the success of one must be the failure of the other. This law is inevitable. In a community of divided business, if your competitor gets more, you must get less of the business in the lines you carry.

They used to tell us that competition lowered prices, but have we not seen many times that competition lowered prices to a point where business was done at a loss? And have you not seen failure where success should have rewarded honest effort?

We hear men talk about "honest competition". What is "honest competition", as we apply it to the world of business? Is it honest effort to win in the race for wealth? Would failure be less humiliating if your competitor employed what the world calls "honest competition" to put you out of business?

In the business world, competition is a race, a war, a contest, in which only one can win. Your success means your brother's failure, and his success means your failure. You have invested all you have in a business. It is a matter of life whether you succeed or fail. Your competitor has the advantage of you. His location is better. He is young, energetic, a live business man. You see your trade going from you day by day. You have bought goods on the reasonable expectation of your old-time trade. Your goods at the end of the year lie on your shelves, while your competitor is mail-ordering the very things you have in stock. Your bills come due, and the money with which you expected to pay them is in the unsold goods upon your shelves. In desperation you struggle to keep your head above what the world calls a wave of "honest competition". You are engulfed. You hear the heartbreaking sound of the last "Sold" as the sheriff closes out the earnings of a life to

pay the price competition has demanded of you in payment of your part toward the keeping up of that glorious system of competition upon which half the world has fattened and the other half has starved since the beginning of time.

Is there in the commercial world today such a thing as "honest competition"? Let us suppose that competition may be honest. Is there an element of christian fellowship in this war of business? Let us see. James and John are brothers of the same church. They are competitors in the same business. There is just so much business in the line they carry, and each is in need of more than there seems to be. John has a large family dependent upon him for support. He has many cares and cannot solicit as urgently as James. James is energetic. He visits prospective customers before and after work hours. Again and again John finds that James has secured the job ahead of him. As winter approaches, he realizes that his idle days have told upon his business. James has outstripped him in the competitive race. The competition may have been honest after the rules of the game, but without fault, John and his innocent family have suffered because of it. Next year John will apply a different rule. He will cut prices. He will work nights. He will underbid to get the job. He will give a cent a bushel more for the grain at the elevator and then short-weight the seller to protect himself from loss. This is the legitimate fruit of competition. It has ruined many a good man in business. It has made criminals of otherwise honest men. It has filled our jails with its victims and our asylums with its unfortunates. The people have winked at it and called it by another name.

These are some of the inevitable results of what we

have called "honest competition", but what must we say when men in their desperation abandon the rules of honesty?

A good old-fashioned tradesman sold meat over the same counter for forty years in his little country town. Here he bought the flower of the farmers' flocks, slaughtered them in his own slaughter house, and sold them to his neighbors at a living profit. On an evil day organized capital in the shape of the so-called "meat trust" put in a shop alongside our old-fashioned friend, and began a system of "honest competition". The old man said, "Let him alone. I have sold my neighbors meat for forty years, and they are satisfied with the treatment I have given them". But prices suddenly dropped, and the old man was obliged to meet competition. He met it, and in a short time he was obliged to close his shop. His old customers bought where they could buy the cheapest and the trust sold at a loss to get the old man out of business. It made at other points what it lost at this while they were putting the old man out, and the moment they had all the trade, prices went back to the profit point.

This is the modern application of the competitive principle, and this modern application is the new condition that has confronted the business world for a number of years. While the people were still applauding the merits of the competitive system, wise business men had learned a thing or two. They recognized that competition meant ruin to someone, and that ruin always fell upon the man least able to suffer from its certain disaster. Competition may be well enough, they said, for the small business, but organized capital cannot risk the hazards of such a system.

This awakening came only two generations ago, and

we are forced today to acknowledge that in all the enterprises requiring large capital, co-operation or combination have taken the place of the old system of war and ruin. They will frankly tell you that they sought this new order as a shelter from the awful war of competition that they were obliged to face in the commercial world.

The people are beginning to understand what co-operation means, not to the men who co-operate alone, but to the men on the other side of the counter. Profits are increased, and products limited to the demands of trade.

These large combinations of capital are commonly called trusts, but the new order is not confined to large capital, for in nearly every line of human endeavor competition is a thing of the past.

The power of these large organizations during the few years of their existence has grown until it is incalculable. It is their business to gather where others have sown, and to do this they have perfected an organization, and a system of exploitation that for working efficiency is the admiration of the profoundest students of the age.

It is claimed by the friends of the trusts that they will bring economy of operation, and through this economy the people will benefit by lowered prices. It is conceded that these results *should* follow, but they are only incident to the controlling objects of such associations of capital. Trusts are formed to make money. Control of any line of business gives them mastery and makes it possible for them to dictate the price to the producer of the raw material as well as to the consumer of the finished product. They hold the power to limit the product as well as the price of the raw material,

drive the purchaser to a single market and then, prompted by insatiate avarice, they increase the price to the consumer, and thus complete the circle of their depredations.

The golden rule of life never finds a place in our competitive system, but bad as it has been, the insatiate greed of organized capital in the present day trusts of the commercial world is a greater menace to the welfare of the people than competition has ever been. Competition has indeed been a war of business, but in that war one-half of the people shared the spoils, while under our trust system all the people are in one way or another the victims of their threats, their intimidations, their bribery, their frauds, and of their wreck and pillage. They close mines and mills and factories at will, without regard to the welfare of the community in which they are established, and without regard to the rights of property owners who have risked their all upon the prospects of business.

The profits of these trusts are simply appalling. The sugar trust has the power to levy tribute of $40,000,000 upon the people of this country by simply advancing the price of sugar one cent a pound for one year. When the people rebel, and threaten legislation in restraint of these depredations, they extort campaign expenses and corruption funds by advancing prices, thus forcing the multitude of honest consumers to furnish the sinews of war for their own destruction. They not only have the power to do these things from year to year, but they do them, and the worst feature of the wrong is in the fact that they control the very articles which the great masses of the people consume in their daily life.

It has all the time been clear to the people that the trusts are contrary to public policy in their management

and in conflict with the common law of the land. Courts have again and again so declared them, but in spite of the clamor of the people, and in spite of the courts, they have multiplied, until at this time competition in all the leading lines of commercial transactions is a thing of the past.

Standard Oil has led the way in the conquest of the commercial world, and its combination reaches, in an organized way, every important country of the earth, thus placing all mankind at its mercy. Since this is true, what is to stand in the way of every other branch of business accomplishing the same end?

But what of the future? Prohibitive legislation has thus far been unavailing. Experience has taught us that for gain men will openly violate the moral law, infringe upon the promised rights of their brothers and refuse to be restrained by the most stringent prohibitive measures.

It is urged by the friends of "Big Business" that in this country of vast enterprises the great volume of business can only be done by large organizations of capital. Assuming that this is true, and assuming also that in well organized and economically managed concerns with unlimited capital there is great economy in the production as well as in the distribution of the necessities of the people, but we cannot help the conviction that we can ill afford to trust the management of such vast enterprises in the hands of the few individuals whose selfish interest would be furthered by harsh measures and methods. The trusts may be here to stay, but if they are, the people must in one way or another get absolute control of them. If control cannot be had in any other way, then the people will have only one remedy left, and that remedy will be public ownership.

The trusts and their methods of doing business have been great teachers. We have learned lessons that will prove valuable to us. We never before knew and felt the real power of organization, but we are beginning to understand their strength. The battle is on. The question, "Shall man or the dollar rule in this country?" will furnish the slogan of war. The people will welcome the conflict. The despoilers of homes must be robbed of their power, even if the very earth must tremble by the displacement. That destroyer of everything but greed in the human heart must go, and with it every combination of men and money that does not leave with the people who toil every cent above a fair profit. Money, and its influence in the commercial world to drive small competitors out of business, must be shorn of its power, and this land of liberty and opportunity must reclaim for its citizens the rights of which they have been robbed by special privilege.

Not to the strong alone, either physically or intellectually, shall the battle be in twentieth century civilization. Not to the "fittest" shall be given the right to rule under the old definitions, nor shall they enjoy the special privileges of exploiting the weaker members of society, for the sons of toil are fixing new rules for the conduct of men in life, and in business, and in politics, and in religion. These new rules will embody the doctrines of the Prince of Peace and enact them into law. The righteousness of the new laws will be judged by a new code of morals. The people will look beyond the law to the finished product. If under the new law's operation unrequitted toil shall bend the backs of labor until their cries of discontent and anguish shall reach Heaven, then the law will be adjudged bad. If poverty and want shall stalk broadcast in a land of plenty, we

will change the law. If idleness shall thrive alongside millions who struggle for their daily bread, we will blame the law that permits it. If organized greed in any form shall pile up millions of wealth to defy the law and exploit labor by robbing it of its just share of earnings, the law will be adjudged bad, and the people will so amend it as to bring the answer of a righteous law in righteous conditions.

But how may this be accomplished? Let us assume that the trust and every form of non-competitive business is a necessity of our modern civilization. Competition is cruel and unchristian. The law of the "Survial of the Fittest" is a relic of the past. It will have no place in the business of our new civilization. The trusts, in every form in which in any measure they control prices, must be operated for and by the people. Do not turn a deaf ear to this solution of a question that, unsolved, threatens the very life of our government. Fifty years ago a cry went up for protection for America's infant industries. We extended the protection asked in the belief and with the promise that such protection was in the interests of labor and low prices. The protected industries grew and waxed strong under the paternal care of the government's policy of protection. Labor cried out against a protection that left the laborers to grope helplessly in the open competitive market for the work that our own people claimed as their right. Labor had no protection. It has ever faced the cruel war of competition, and battled against the underpaid labor of foreign lands. The trust of today is the finished product of protection. Competition is not a factor in the fixing of the price. We witness today the giant protected industries of the nation threatening political parties, that by those threats they may force the raising of

tariff rates, while unprotected labor begs for bread, and thousands of mothers and children eke out an existence from the pittance they earn in the factories of our government-made captains of industry. The mansion on the hill and the hovel in the valley are the finished product of price, and the price that built the mansion, and the price that built the hovel, as well as the forced right to live in it, was fixed by the same authority with the threat of a thousand hungry men and women ready to take the job if the price was rejected.

Lloyd George, England's great Commoner, has written into the laws of that nation a minimum wage. Is the authority thus assumed unwarranted? Does it seem unreasonable that this government should protect our helpless laborers by fixing a minimum wage? Who is ready to say that this is unjust, and who is ready to say that we have overstepped the authority of our time-honored constitution? What about this old time-honored constitution, anyway? It was made more than a hundred years ago to fit a nation in its swaddling clothes. It was made to meet the new and untried condition of life. It was made to secure to the people rights never enjoyed by any other nation on earth. It is our constitution and we have changed it nineteen times. Will anyone wonder that it has needed changes? It is our right, it is our duty, to enlarge its authority to meet every new condition that our new civilization demands. Has any American failed to revere that constitution and the wise men who gave it to us? Had they not been inspired by a burning love for humanity, the finished product of their efforts would never have presented to the world the most complete and exhaustive bill of rights that the people of any country of any age had previously enjoyed.

We talk about the trusts that are today exploiting the labor of the nation as well as the consumers of the products of that labor. We talk about the unsolved problem of the labor of the nation. We philosophize on the great struggle between capital and labor. We ask the question that has never been answered to the satisfaction of the thinking world, who fixes the price of things? We explain how national money panics are brewed over night, and then we understand something of the power of the men who can in a day divide the value of every dollars worth of the property of the nation by two and in the doing of this double the value of every promise for future payment represented by notes, and bonds, and taxes, and mortgages in the land. The power to name the price, and the power to control the money of a country is a greater power than any sovereign on earth ever enjoyed. The people are wondering by just what mathematical computation the fixers of price arrive at the answer.

They tell us that the sugar trust ascertains the amount of sugar necessary to supply the demands of the people for a year, and then after ascertaining the amount produced and adding to the price they paid the profit they demand, the price to the public for each month of the year is fixed f. o. b. New York, and the price to all retailers is New York price, plus the freight to his station. How easy and simple. But the sugar trust owns the factory, and fixes the price of the beets, and the cane, and the labor.

Who can solve the problem of price? Who knows what the price of a bushel of wheat, or corn, or the price of a pound of beef or pork should be? Can the producers of these necessities of life depend upon the principles of competition and of supply and demand to

bring to the world a just solution to the question of a just price?

There is not an intelligent man in America who would not promptly answer, No. What, then, is the remedy? The remedy for these awful wrongs is to be found in a system of standardization from the labor that enters into the value of every product to the finished product in the commercial world. As long as this nation permits by law the power to continue to fix prices, just so long a few men will be able to obstruct the flow of the products of toil on their way from the farms and the factories to the millions of people whose very lives must depend upon them to keep that demon of hunger and starvation from the home.

In another chapter we have more fully elucidated this power in the world, and the remedies for the wrongs that seem so threatening.

Is anybody trying to solve this complex problem? Are our schools bringing the problem to the attention of the young men and women of the country?

Let no man underestimate the importance of some righteous solution to these questions and to the importance of bringing that solution at the first moment possible.

Chapter VIII

ARBITRATION

Nowhere in our complex civilization have we built without regard for the more fundamental rights of our citizens than in the system of jurisprudence that today is settling the disputes of the world.

Since the days of Adam man's associations have been the source of misunderstandings and disputes. Cain and Abel settled the first dispute recorded in human history by the arbitrament of physical force, and for centuries, and indeed until recently, that force has been employed in the settlement of disputes of individuals as well as nations.

Law has fixed the rules of life among men, and new modes of adjusting their contentions.

In the jurisprudence of every law-governed country is indelibly impressed the fundamental doctrine of human rights, but back of the written law of nations is the common law of the world based solely upon men's individual rights.

No student of fundamental law has failed to discern how studiously the old time-honored jurists made every decision of the court bend to the idea of human rights, but the evolution of modern society, with its demands for new laws, has written into the jurisprudence of our times new measures by which men's rights are ascertained. The old jurists indeed sat in judgment over questions of human rights, but the jurists of our generation determine or measure these rights by the rules of law alone. Men ask in this age of commercialism, "Is it lawful?" and not "Is it right?"

By this measure we have come to judge the world's transactions. Not from choice we have written into the supreme law of the land decisions based upon the law as it is written in the statutes, with only small regard for the more fundamental doctrines of human rights.

We blush as we record this statement, because the laws of our country are primarily intended to secure to the individual the greatest possible share of men's inherent rights.

Well do we know that the learned jurists of our country will deny that men's rights under the laws are held paramount to their rights under the moral law, but no matter how strenuously the fact may be denied, the world knows that the judge on the bench is sworn to render his decision between men purely on the question of law. If a man goes into court, he places himself in the hands of the law, and the court has no choice but to render a decision on the cold proposition of the written law on the point involved.

Courts have been established to administer the laws of the land; courts, whose jurisdiction reaches from the smallest matter, to the question that may be heard in the highest appellate court of the land, but the people must know that a large per cent of the litigation in the country is due to a lack of knowledge of the laws rather than a disposition to disobey them.

Do you wonder that this is true? The courts hold that ignorance of the law excuses no man from obeying it, or for not paying the penalty for disobedience? This holding is never disputed, but we ask what opportunity have the people had of knowing the law? In every state we find that there is only one printed copy of the law to every two or three thousand people, and perhaps not more than five per cent of the population of any

state has ever had opportunity even to see a copy of the statutes of the state in which he lives.

Laws are rules of conduct. Would you expect a man to obey a rule he did not know? We speak of this to emphasize that a large per cent of the people live a whole lifetime, and do all their business without any serious knowledge of the law, and act wholly upon a moral code of right that has prevailed among men since the early days of organized society.

When a man finds that his moral code comes in conflict with the statutes of the state, he must face the statutes as they are laid down in the law, and if his conduct has conflicted with that law, no matter what his moral code may say, he must abide the decision on the law, right or wrong, no matter whether he was wise or ignorant of its provisions.

We do not insist that a man should not be amenable to the law of the land whether he knows the law or not, but every fair-minded man will agree that opportunity to know the laws should be easily accessible to every subject of the government, every man and woman who is expected to obey them, and thus the hardship of requiring obedience to the laws of which the people are ignorant would be removed.

But we must not forget that the courts are the final arbiters of all questions wherein the laws have been violated, whether it be a criminal offense or a cause for a civil action. Criminal offenses can only be dealt with by the stern processes of the law, but civil actions, or disputes between man and man, and between men and corporations, can become questions for arbitration.

You will ask, Why arbitrate? Are not the processes of the law quite as effective in the settlement of disputes among men as arbitration could be? To this question

we must reply in the negative. There are many reasons why arbitration among men is better than the processes of law as it is applied in our courts. The law is slow in its processes of administration of justice. It is common knowledge that litigants are worn out by the law's delays. A man may have a case ever so urgent and just, and by the law's delay alone he will be driven to abandon a just cause of action, and suffer the loss of every dollar involved, rather than take the chance of a long drawn out litigation. Attorneys pursue a policy of delay in the courts, and the courts permit it, until prudent judgment is dictating to honest litigants that it is better to abandon their rights than to submit to an application of the law that permits legal piracy to use the law's delays to avoid the payment of just obligation.

Then again it must be said that our present application of the law, with its technical rulings, makes a lawsuit more a test of the skill of attorneys than a test of the rights of litigants. Who will deny that this is true? If you have failed to understand this vital fact, go into court and observe how helpless a poorly equipped attorney is against the technical tactics of one skilled in the sharp practices that prevail today. Who has not been a victim of this monstrous wrong, and who will not admit that in a large per cent of the cases the rights of litigants are lost sight of, and the skill of the attorneys is the basis of the final judgment in the case?

We make the charge that in the application of the laws, courts must necessarily ignore questions of right between parties, or subordinate them to the technical questions of the law. We do not complain of this, but make note of it simply that the reader may get the thought as we understand it for the purpose of future reference, and that the remedy may be better understood.

We boast of our policy of protection of property rights by law, but we forget that through the application of the laws we are every day using the law as a means of acquiring property in defiance of the rights of our neighbors. So true is this statement that there has grown up in the business world a practice that permits and excuses the acquiring of property by the rule of the law alone, and we wink at methods of gathering to ourselves wealth by these processes so long as we are within the pale of the law and keep out of the penitentiary.

But there has grown up other abuses under our system of applying law that must be mentioned. I refer to the jury system of which we have so much boasted. It sounds well to be promised the right of a trial by a jury of twelve good and lawful men—our peers—but when we learn that the qualifying of the men who are competent to sit on the jury in the trial of cases that have gained prominence in the public prints are such as to stamp them as the least fit to understand the rights of parties, either under the laws of the state, or under the moral law, we lose faith in our time-honored jury system.

Then when we hear of the bribery of jurors, and when we know that in the selection of every panel for the trial of a cause in court men's personal prejudices are weighed, not by the court, but by the attorneys on either side of the contention, and those are allowed to sit whose known prejudices are either favorable or unfavorable to any given contention, we simply stop and inquire what this might mean. In the selection of a jury this is true no matter that the opposing attorney has an equal chance to place men of his liking and prejudices upon the jury when we know that the sheriff as he calls talesmen can place in the jury box men

whose known prejudices are favorable to any contention that he may see fit for any cause to espouse. No court will deny that this is true, or that a sheriff may have the power in the selection of a jury when the regular panel is exhausted to influence the selection of that jury favorable in their known prejudices to any given contention, and if this be true, a trial before a jury is a farce.

Much has been said in the public print about "court fixing," so much indeed that the people are ready to criticise the court the moment the decision is adverse to their opinion, even though they heard not a single word of the evidence in the case.

Court fixing and jury fixing, either by direct bribery or by procuring a prejudiced jury, or by the hiring one man to block the finding of a verdict, has become so common that the courts have lost much of that time-honored veneration among the people that should characterize a tribunal of justice. Not this alone. It has come to be a commonly accepted fact that a man with money has a distinct advantage of the poor man before our courts. This is a dangerous criticism, and yet no man can be found who will deny that there are reasons for such criticisms of our courts. As long as the people can point to cases where rich and influential men convicted of wrecking banks and of wrecking whole communities through the manipulations of corporation organizations and stock juggling can secure complete pardon for these outrages upon a trusting people, while a poor man who stole a ham for his starving family must suffer the penalty of the law, there is something radically wrong with the application of the laws.

Our courts are our legal tribunals of justice. To them we must look for the trial of men charged with

high crimes. Here the judge must not forget that in his public capacity he owes a duty to the public which he serves that far transcends the mere finding of a judgment and the punishment of criminals. The infliction of the penalty of the law upon a culprit should serve a two fold purpose, first, the punishment of the criminal, and at the same time the reformation of the man, and secondary to these objects, we must not lose sight of the restraining effect of punishment upon the public mind in the deterring of those who might be ready to commit some other offense. The majesty of the law must be made so appealing that the people will come to know that, great or small, rich or poor, every citizen must stand before that court with no other power or influence than every other citizen.

Courts must not expect to enjoy the confidence of the people as long as they permit delays in administering justice until the winning party as well as the man who loses in the contention must both be losers by the litigation. Criticisms of the courts are so common everywhere, and the justice of many of those criticisms seem so well founded that we sometimes stop in our inquiry to ask ourselves, "What is to be the remedy?" The courts of our country are intended to be the shelter and shield of our liberties and our personal rights. We never appeal to them unless our rights or our liberties have been infringed. Under their oath of office every court must swear allegiance to our constitution and our laws made under it. Their business is the interpretation of those laws. Behind the constitution of our country stands that great constitution of the world written by the finger of God upon the tables of stone, and proclaimed by Moses the great law giver from Mount Sinai. Behind the statutes of our several states is the golden rule of

life, given by the Christ to the world as the law of Christian brotherhood. Written in the hearts of man as the basis of all human law are the constitution and the golden rule of life, and the people demand that every interpretation of both the constitution and the law shall draw its inspiration of wisdom from that eternal law of truth from whence they came. The judge who fails to draw from that fountain in the interpretation of the laws loses sight of the underlying principle of human rights as defined by human law, and renders his opinions subject to just criticism. The law that fixes rules in conflict, or without regard to these inspired interpretations of human rights and duties is based upon the purely commercial and worldly side, and has no place in the statutes of states, or in the hearts and lives of the people.

Boldly do we proclaim that the law and its interpretation has lost sight of the golden rule of life. By a thousand tests we can verify the statement that by design, laws have been placed upon our statutes everywhere for no other purpose than for the protection of special interests. By evidence that brooks no denial we know that the same special interests that secured the passage of laws for their protection also secured the election of judges, who either from one motive or another would give a friendly interpretation of the laws thus passed in the interests of these favored classes.

No man who is acquainted with our code of legal proceedings will deny that through the law's delays it is abortive of justice. Nor will any man gainsay that a case at bar is a test of the ability of lawyers rather than a trial of the rights of the parties.

What a splendid privilege do we enjoy in our constitutional right to a trial of our cause in the highest

tribunal of the land! Do the people know just what this privilege is costing them in both money and time? To understand this, follow a case from the justice to the supreme court of your state. To begin an action in the justice court the amount must be less than $200. You must employ an attorney whether you lose or win. If the cause is appealed you must wait the sitting of the next term of the district court, where you are very likely to wait a year while your evidence is either being obliterated or scattered over the country out of reach. When you finally get your trial and you decide to appeal to the supreme court of your state, you will find that your costs have reached an enormous sum. The case need not reach the supreme court if the party appealing so wishes, for one year, and when it does get there, in many of the states, the final decision would not be reached and handed down under two years, and not then unless it was urged by the adverse party. To get a case ready for the supreme court the appealing party must not only have a complete printed abstract of the evidence in the lower court, but he must produce in the court a complete printed brief of the arguments he wishes to make before that court. When a case is once lodged in that august body we call the supreme court, no matter how urgently your rights demand a speedy hearing, you may as well go home and forget that you have a case in court. Your frame of mind may not be the best, but you must reflect before you criticise our system of enforcing justice. You must not ask how many months the court is in session during the year, nor how many days of those months they are in session for business. You must not expect them to work eleven months and have only one month for a vacation, and you must not expect them to work as many hours a day

as you work out on your farm. Overworked! Yes, many months behind, and increased courts, until the judges themselves find difficulty in finding decisions that will not be in conflict with decisions that were written only a year ago.

Your decision is finally handed down and you have lost, not because your case was not just, but because your attorney had failed to protect your rights in some technical point that was as foreign to the issues of right as the fall of Rome was to the building of the Panama Canal.

Well may the people ask, "What is the mission of our courts?" The answer to that question can only be, "The mission of our courts is to render just judgments between litigants," but this answer brings the question, "Are the courts fulfilling their mission in the government?"

Before answering this question I want to confess to a profound regard for a large majority of the noble jurists that have honored the bench, as well as that honorable body of men known as the legal profession, but when I assert that a large per cent of the judgments on the dockets of the courts of this country have found their way to judgment in absolute defiance of the laws, or the laws of right as measured by the golden rule of life, I assert a truth that will not be disputed by any judge or attorney. When I assert that all the judgments rendered in the lower courts in a year will rarely if ever amount to as much as the cost of securing them, I have stated a fact that the records themselves will prove. When I assert that the law's delays, and the proverbial uncertainty of bringing a just judgment as well as the attendant costs of prosecuting the case in the courts to obtain justice is driving men to tolerate grave

wrongs rather than to apply to the courts for redress of their grievances, I am stating what men everywhere recognize as a fact.

What, then, is the matter with our time-honored system of jurisprudence?

Do I need to tell the people that our courts are being used as a means of exploitation? Would I need to offer proof of this statement? Is it not a fact that is susceptible of the best proof that there are at this time attorneys whose business as attorneys is to bring actions in the courts and hold the threat of the law as a club over the heads of men to extort money in defiance of the law?

If this statement is true, what can be said of the holding of our courts that every attorney is in fact a part of the court. Is it true that the attorney is a part of the court in which he brings an action? If it is, does not this honorable mantle of authority bring with it grave responsibilities? Can it be said that the court as a party to such a partnership is responsible for the acts of the attorney? And then does this partnership place upon the head of the attorney responsibility for the acts of the court?

Courts! After you have answered these questions, will you tell us as you sit in judgment upon the trial of a case before you, when you find the golden rule of right on one side of the contention, and the law on the other side, who gets the judgment? I will relieve our honorable courts the embarrassment of making answer as I say that no matter how plainly the judge may see the confliction between the right and the law, he is the servant of the law, and his judgment must be rendered accordingly. It is his sworn duty to render his decision on the law. We are not complaining of this, but we

insist that the laws are made to cover conditions that are general, and that no statute can be made to cover every condition that will arise between men. Because of this fact the courts are many times helpless to render just judgments under their handicaps in a multitude of cases.

Lawyer! You have been employed to prosecute the case at bar. It is your case. If you win, it will mean prestige, more practice and better fees. If you lose, your client will be dissatisfied, and you may not be able to explain to his satisfaction. He may judge you incompetent. He may accuse you of betrayal. The public looks askance at a loser. The irony of fate says, "I must win." "Right or wrong, I must win this case." You go into a case to seek a judgment. You avail yourself of every technicality of the law known to the profession. You contend that you have been employed to win, and with your whole soul you bend every energy toward that purpose.

Client! Whether you stand before the court as plaintiff or defendant, you contend for what you deem your rights. If you lose, it is a double loss. Blind to every question but the question of winning, you gather your evidence and your energies for the fight. You are sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Did you do this, or did you withhold something because it was not asked you, or because it might prejudice the case? Ah! You told the truth. Your conscience would not let you swear a lie. Your opponent was not so conscientious. He swort a lie, and proved it by a witness that was not more conscientious than he. The judge heard the testimony, and as he looked you in the face he felt that you had sworn the truth, but judges cannot read minds. It is their business to render judg-

ments on the preponderance of the evidence, and the preponderance of the evidence was against you. So was the judgment, and the costs that must follow the judgment. You paid the judgment and the costs, and then your attorney, and went home to philosophize over the justice of that "grandest structure of jurisprudence ever built by human government."

We would not have our readers understand that we have disrespect for the laws or their application, nor for that splendid line of judicial decisions that have been written into the supreme laws of the land. They are so full of truth, so full of legal definitions of right, so profound in their argument of fundamental law, and so exhaustive in their enumeration of men's inherent rights, that they can only elicit the admiration of thinking men everywhere, but we wish to be understood to criticize the system of legal jurisprudence by which our laws are administered.

The great masses of the people have little litigation. They need an easy and a speedy means of settling their differenences. They never apply to the courts as a means of getting advantage, or for exploitation. They measure their rights by a code of morals as old as civilization. Delay is intolerable to them. It works an injury to both parties. It stands in the way of bringing a just decision. Technical advantage is beneath their dignity and their sense of right. Simple justice is the measure of their code of law. They know of their right of appeal, but they know that an appeal means defeat to the man who wins as well as the man who loses.

Will someone tell us why, if an appeal to the supreme court cannot be taken in cases below $20 when the case is tried by a jury, upon the same reasoning it might not be made a hundred or a thousand dollars or why an appeal might not be eliminated in all cases?

I want to assert at this point that the people believe more in the honesty of their neighbors than they do in the efficiency of the courts. What they want is some easy and cheap method of bringing exact justice in the disputed affairs of life. They are beginning to wonder if we have not built up a judicial oligarchy in this country that will erstwhile become a menace to our free institutions if such an oligarchy is not already built.

Already laws have been passed preventing all but lawyers from holding judicial offices above justice of the peace, and we must witness with concern the fact that our congress has for years been a congress of lawyers. This means that our laws are being made by professional lawyers, they are being interpreted by compulsory lawyer courts, and, largely, they are being executed by lawyer executives.

Does this not mean that either by law or through consent we have built up a professional test for public service that has in effect closed the doors to all who have not secured a professional training, and hold a license to practice in the courts?

We do not mention this fact to arouse antagonism against the legal profession in this country, but to call attention to what seems the building up of a legal impediment to advancement that erstwhile may become a galling yoke upon liberty loving Americans.

What is the remedy for all this misuse or abuse of the law, and the courts for their failure to fulfill the mission for which they were established? This question must be answered in the future of this country. So much has been said in recent years about the recall of judges that no thinking man can fail to recognize that the people have lost confidence in the efficacy of the courts.

Nothing can be gained by assailing the good name of honorable judges, but the fact that they have not cried out for remedies of the wrongs that everybody recognizes as fundamental is sufficient excuse for the complaints that are heard on every hand.

The people will not long brook the delays that courts refuse or neglect to eliminate from court procedure. They will not tolerate the sharp technical practices of attorneys with the sanction of the courts to defeat justice. They are at this moment crying out against belittling the trial of a just cause in the court into the trial of the skill of technical attorneys instead of a trial of the case at bar.

Court practices must be simplified. The courts themselves should see that this is done without delay. If they will not remedy this flagrant wrong the people, through their legislative right, must do it.

But even when that is done we will find that the entire system of judicial proceedings is cumbersome, and so long as this is true its work will be fraught with dissatisfaction.

I ask again, "What is the remedy?" The remedy for the present day judicial interpretations of the laws and their application to the settlement of disputes among men is to be found only in a system of arbitration.

For many years the things that we have recorded pertaining to the failure of the courts in securing justice to litigants have been admitted by all thinking men, among which are many of the brightest attorneys of the country. In some of the states attempts have been made to simplify the code of legal procedure, and especially to eliminate much of the courts' delays. These efforts have been fruitful of little good.

Voluntary arbitration has been written into the

statutes of some of the more progressive states, but voluntary arbitration can seldom be made effective while both parties to the controversy must sign consent to arbitrate. So long as the consent of both parties must be had before the remedy can be applied, little can be accomplished.

Arbitration is the Christian way of settling disputes among men. It knows no motive but a desire to do right between man and man. It recognizes that human frailty is liable to err. It is written into the doctrines of some of the most influential denominations of the church that "brother cannot go to law with brother," but in this intensely commercial age, this church law has lost its force, and stands upon the ritual as a dead letter. In this law of the church arbitration was compulsory. Right between the brethren was the measure by which the case was determined, and the golden rule of life was the law of the case at hand, and when this had been ascertained, there was no appeal.

Who will say that arbitration is wrong? Who will say that it will not find the rights between litigants? If it will do this, why not make it compulsory?

Under the present application of the law, if I chose to sue a man, the court in which my petition is filed *issues* a summons fixing a date for the trial of the case. When the sheriff's summons showing legal service is returned, the court's authority is complete. Should I prefer to arbitrate the case before our friends and neighbors rather than to have it tried in a court I am handicapped because the laws of Nebraska do not permit arbitration unless both parties consent. Arbitration should be effective upon the request of either party to the dispute. This would settle the authority. Under the present law both parties must agree.

Compulsory arbitration will settle disputes along purely ethical lines, and will at once drive a large per cent of the trouble and litigation out of the land. It will bring justice so speedily that no man will be tempted to wear the other out by delays. It would unload from the backs of the taxpayers a large per cent of the burden of expenses. It will so purify the atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty that the inefficiency and delay of our courts have forced upon the people and into the public opinion, that instead of a feeling of doubt there would be a feeling of confidence. It will eliminate the finding of verdicts on technicalities and without due consideration of the moral rights of litigants. But we would not stop with compulsory arbitration of disputes between individuals. If the principle of arbitration is good between men it will be good between nations. If it will work between nations it will be good between the disputes of capital and labor.

Only a few years ago a great railroad strike prevented the moving of coal in the face of approaching winter. The people's lives were in peril. Both parties to the controversy were obstinate. Committees pleaded for settlement without avail. Arbitration was several times tendered only to be refused. The public became alarmed. They saw ahead the stinging wintry days when rich and poor alike must suffer. They petitioned the government to compel arbitration, but the government was without authority. The public, innocent of any wrong, was at the mercy of a heartless corporation contending over a few cents pay to laborers already underpaid, but this nation saw as it never saw before the necessity of securing some effective means of settlement between organized labor and organized capital.

There is at this time only one remedy, and that remedy is compulsory arbitration.

Has capital no rights under the law? Are its interests in danger when the simple rule of right is applied to its methods? Let them open their books and let the light of truth in upon the contention. Labor has rights that must be respected. It has a right to continuous employment during efficient service, because it is the basis of every created thing. We must remember that the public has rights that must be respected, no matter whether the corporation is doing a public service business or not. There is no law at this time by which all these rights can be respected at the same time, and perhaps no law can be framed that will meet the exigencies of all cases but a law of compulsory arbitration.

Compulsory arbitration is the application of the golden rule in the settlement of the disputes among men. This is fundamental. When men shall find themselves willing to abide the decision of their neighbors instead of having them decided at the bar of a court, they will be able to get speedy settlement of their differences with the least risk of a miscarriage of justice.

In a Christian democracy every city and every precinct in the United States should have an established arbitration court where the people could go with the smallest matter that may engender disputes in the community. It is safe to say that such a court, at the head of which must sit not necessarily men trained in the laws, but men well grounded in the eternal principles of right between man and man, would divide the litigation in any state by two, and it would become so popular in a few years that the larger cases would soon find their way into that court because it would assure the bringing of a speedy verdict and exact justice.

These thoughts are not new. They are simply old thoughts that are so righteous as to demand their adop-

tion as a means of escape from the handicap of miscarriage of justice in our courts.

Have you not read of the wonderful work of such men as Judge Ben Lindsay of Denver, and many others in the cities of our country, among the boys? This work is so wonderful and so astounding as to have shaken the very nation by its results.

Some of the cities have established what is termed "Free Legal Aid" courts, where the poor can get legal service and legal advice without paying for it. A "free legal aid" court is simply the cry of the community for a remedy of the evils of our system of jurisprudence. Under the very eyes of the courts of justice the rights of those who are not able to defend them are trampled under the feet of men. Along with the other handicaps of poverty, this handicap has been intolerable.

Do we not realize that more than half of the cases that receive the attention of the courts should never have been brought? Seven divorce cases out of every ten should never have disgraced the records of a court. A friendly investigation by some good old mother, and the kindly and intelligent advice of her great heart would bring the parties to reflect before they filed their exaggerated pleadings and put up the bars in vile and untrue statements that must stand in the way of any friendly adjustment. Christian arbitration would save many a family from the ruin that generally follows such domestic troubles. This nation must come to study the underlying causes of the domestic troubles of this age and find the remedy for them.

Nothing has been said about the expense of such a court as we are urging. To this we would say: There is not a church in the land that could not furnish to the arbitration court a list of old and well qualified men and

women who would be glad to render service as arbitrators upon request, and to perform this service for the good of the community when necessary, but when not necessary a fee would be fixed in the same manner as the laws now provide for the payment of jurors and arbitrators at this time.

One more argument for such an arbitration court and that argument is the fact that in all cases the arbitrators chosen might and should be men who had knowledge of the business of the men who were contending. If a complaint called for the knowledge of men trained in a certain business or calling such men or women would be chosen. This plan of selecting jurors so far excels our present jury system as to command the greatest respect, for it would call into service in each individual case the best trained men to do the work that the litigants needed. Christian arbitration under the law is the easy remedy for the slow and uncertain processes of the law and it must appeal to the judgment of every thinking man and woman who has knowledge of the present inefficient methods of settling disputes.

Chapter IX

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Industry began when God entered into that partnership with man in the production of the foodstuffs upon which he must subsist at the very beginning of time. Human life has ever been dependent upon God's promise of the sunshine and the shower, and upon man's diligence in his efforts to claim the promise, and to redeem it by doing his part in the production of the good things of life.

From the creation of man until fifty years ago the machine had little part in the economy of production, but today we find that machinery has so enhanced the power of man to produce the wealth that goes into the nation's storehouses that one man, by the aid of machinery, can produce more wealth in a day than many men could produce without the machine.

What is the productive capacity of this nation? Who can answer that question? Before a nation goes to war it must know how many ablebodied men it has to go to the front in defense of the nation's flag. In the same manner it should know just what its real force for the production of wealth is, and be able to keep that productive force engaged in the work of producing the things that are necessary for the support of the nation.

What are the available forces of production in our country? No one has yet answered that question, but we assume without argument that we would agree that such a force would be represented by the ablebodied men and women of the entire country. But is this force available? Can this nation rely upon its ablebodied men

and women as a real productive force? You will readily answer, "It cannot." Then I will not need to tell you that in every section of our country there are men and women living from childhood to old age who never in a lifetime produced a dollars worth of wealth. We sometimes call them the "Idle Rich." They, by inheritance or otherwise, have possession of enough of this world's goods to supply their earthly needs for a lifetime without effort. "May an ablebodied man claim a share of the products of labor who never rendered his share of the labor that produced it?"

Since this question is raised someone is asking, "Why should all labor, when our storehouses have always been supplied with enough and to spare?" We answer, "There are thousands of men and women toiling today for their daily bread, who, long ago, had produced enough of this world's goods to supply a dozen people for a lifetime, and they are still obliged to choose between hard labor and the poorhouse, and this, too, while the labor of those same hands are supporting an army of young, ablebodied men and women in absolute idleness."

This question is raised, "How many years of labor is necessary to supply the wants of an average family, if the head of the family labors eight hours a day and three hundred days in the year?" The answer to this question is easy. Twenty years with the improved machinery of this generation would be more than sufficient. Our storehouses would be full to overflowing and our people would be happy.

Fifty years ago, before this age of industrial conquest had fastened itself upon us, a different condition prevailed. When we look back we call those "The good old days of our fathers." Well, they were happy days even

if the soap was made in the home, and the good old mother knit the hosiery, and made every article of clothing for both men and women, and yet all were supplied with plenty. In those good old days all the family worked. Labor was honorable. Maternity was sacredly respected in the raising of a family. Divorces were rare. Idiocy was almost unknown. Insane asylums were seldom needed. Penitentiaries were almost without use, but those good old days are gone, and a new civilization with its new demands is upon us.

They tell us that the human family is demanding more today than it ever demanded before. This is true. It ought to demand more. It has a right to more. The labor of this nation has produced the things that have gone into the storehouses, and nothing is too good for the men and women who produced them.

This generation does produce and demand more of the good things of life, more of the blessings of this new age than any generation that has preceded it, but does this fact lay upon the backs of the few the burden of providing those blessings, and give no explanation for the idleness all around them?

Tell us, men of this thoughtless generation! Just by what right may a man go to the storehouses and demand a share of the daily bread that the labor of this nation has produced, and there offer as an excuse for not working, the story that a good old father had left enough stored energy to support him for his natural life? *The duty to earn is the right to live*, and when God shall come, if He ever does, to scourge the world of sin, He will drive the idlers from the land first, because of all sinners, the idler is the worst.

So long have we been accustomed to the story of toil from early childhood until the tottering footsteps of old

age falter and fail at the edge of an open grave, and so long has this condition gone unchallenged, that we have spent little energy in the study of man's capacity to produce wealth, nor have we given thought to the doctrine that "wealth belongs to him who creates it." We have contented ourselves with that infamous doctrine that "wealth belongs to him who gets it," and we have given ourselves little concern as to the manner of the getting.

The laborers of this nation have been taught, and have without thinking subscribed to that doctrine, or theory of life, that "man's labors begin with the cradle and end with the grave," and they have so long been content with that doctrine that we almost fear to suggest this thought, lest we agitate the laborers to reckless reasoning, and the idlers to unjust criticism.

It is indeed true that we are living in a complex civilization. Fifty years ago a man with his crude implements could produce enough for his large family and to spare. He toiled upon his farm while his good wife from early dawn till bedtime devoted herself to caring and providing for the family. As I look back over a stretch of fifty years and see my good old mother, bent with the burden of her toil, doing the work of an old-fashioned family, many times burning the midnight oil in her devoted efforts to fulfill what she cherished as a duty to her loved ones, I wonder whether the good Lord did not endow her with more strength and endurance than was given to ordinary mortals, but this cannot be, for long before she had lived her alloted three score years and ten, the silver threads of age, the stooping form, the unsteady step, told us that she would soon join him, who had gone before to that only rest they had ever known that did not come by some forced circumstance.

Since those days, the God of our fathers has unlocked the storehouses of His hidden mysteries. The master mind of man has harnessed the hidden forces of nature, and by machinery of his own conception, has applied those forces to the production of wealth. So perfectly do these applied powers work for their masters that in the manufacture of the articles of daily consumption, one man can do the work of many. No man knows at this time the exact per cent of enhancement machinery has brought in the production of wealth, but it is certain that if all men worked as they did fifty years ago, the nation's storehouses would soon fill to overflowing, and the people would enjoy a well-merited rest.

Labor first looked upon the machine as its natural enemy. They saw it as a competitor for their job. Even as early as 1877 men were facing "the job!" In Massachusetts, that great manufacturing state in 1877, machinery the equivalent of 1,913,448 men were in actual operation, while only 266,339 persons were actually employed. Here we have a displacement of the labor of 1,645,145 men and the production enhanced six times. These figures were given in a report to the government forty years ago by Carroll D. Wright, and since that time the machine has been perfected in a thousand ways and its production enhanced many times.

Labor had a right to be afraid of the influence of the machine. It still urged that the machine would drive honest labor out of employment and bring a condition of enforced idleness. They argued that idleness would brew mischief, while employment would promote virtue. They insisted that labor would no longer be respected, and that laboring men would not find an honorable place in society. They further insisted that the laboring people are honest, and that honest men only wanted an opportunity to labor for their starving families.

These fears were shared by many of the best and wisest men of the nation, because they were the natural answer to the wonderful power of enhanced productive possibilities.

But what is the power of production at this time, forty years after this report of Carroll D. Wright? The census bulletin of 1909 gives the number of wage earners as 6,615,046 and the product of their manufacture as $20,672,052,000. This is a per capita production of $3,127 worth of goods. This per capita varies in the several states of the Union. In Kansas it was $7,353, and in Nebraska it was $8,887. Thus it will be seen that in the nation one man in the manufacturing industries of the entire country produced every day he worked $10.40 worth of goods, while in Nebraska he would produce $27.22 per day.

These figures are given to show the productive capacity of man, and from them we can learn what the entire nation could produce if all the people were engaged in the business of production.

But it must not be forgotten that all men who do honest work are not in this sense producers of wealth. Under our complex civilization the luxuries of yesterday are the necessities of today. The people of the corn belt demand the products of the citrus belt. The fruits of the Pacific find their way into the homes of every section of the nation. The mines must be worked to produce coal and metals that go into the industries of the country. The railroads must be manned to carry on the exchanges of the products of every section. All these are laborers in every right sense and every economy of our civilization.

But why study this question further? Have we not shown conclusively that with our present means of pro-

duction, our workers are able to give to the people more of the blessings of their toil than they can consume?

The basic principle of industry is labor. It is the fundamental first cause of every created thing. "Out of the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" was a command to labor, and that command carried with it a promise, implied it is true, but just as sacred, and none the less certain, that if a man labors, to him must belong the result of that labor. To him it must belong, to have, to hold, to sell, or to give to his brother.

The first law of ownership is the fulfillment of God's command to labor for the bread of life. This law is fundamental. It has never been repealed. No man can dispute it, and he who claims ownership by this right bases his claim to ownership upon God's promise, and that promise was good.

The world is beginning to understand as it never understood before, the meaning of that oft-repeated assertion, "Agriculture is fundamental." In the economy of God's creation, agriculture is necessary to the life of every individual living upon the earth. If this is true, every problem of agriculture is the individual concern of every man and woman living today, as well as for the generations who shall follow after us, and upon whom the people will be so dependent for keeping inviolate that partnership with God in the production of the foodstuffs of the world.

No student of affairs will dispute the statement that among the many grave problems of the world, no problem has reached as high a state of perfection in its road to a complete solution of production as the problem of agriculture.

The farmer sows in the springtime with an abiding faith in God's promise of the sunshine and the shower.

He cultivates his crops. He fights his natural enemies, frost, drought, hail, thorns and thistles, and a thousand other enemies, and from the seedtime until the harvest his reward is dependent upon intelligent and constant toil, under conditions over which he can have no control.

But when his crop is gathered and the labors of the summer have been rewarded with the bounty of an abundant harvest, he finds himself confronted with graver problems than any with which he has previously been obliged to cope. Here he is face to face with the greatest problem that has ever confronted the world—the problem of distribution, and associated with it the problem of price.

I do not overstate the fact when I say that at no time in the history of the world was the problem of distribution and the problem of price so acute as they are at this moment, for what matters how faithfully the great army of farmers study the problems of production if, after the storehouses of the nation are full to overflowing, the people, not in this country alone, but in the world, must starve?

For half a century the farmers have been the victims of such varying prices as to arouse suspicion that the prices of the products of their strenuous toil were not the result of natural conditions. When they were obliged to sell their corn at 10 cents and their wheat at 35 cents per bushel, after marketing it long distances, they were pacified with the story of overproduction. When a panic in the money market stagnated the demand for their products, they were fed on the story that panics were caused by conditions over which they had no control. Even in these times of intellectual research, and of knowledge of commercial conditions, a deliberate attempt is being made to raise the tariff, and insist that

the "tariff bogy" has been the cause of low prices. The farmers are aroused. They know well that in the reconstruction that was sure to come to this country after the war with all its blighting effects, they were the first to receive the deadly blows of ruinous prices. By a thousand tests they felt that even though the world stood in dire need of the products of the farm, and withholding of foodstuffs meant starvation to millions of the children of men, a merciless army of profiteers were in power in the work of distributing the foodstuffs of the world, and they seemed to forget that the foodstuffs of the farms of this nation were necessary to the very life of every man and woman and child under the folds of Old Glory. And this complaint is not yet all. Farmers well remembered the half-century-old fight they were obliged to make to secure and protect their rights to honest weights and measures. Dishonest scales and weights were the sore problems of the farmers of forty years ago, but today they have been obliged to fight a battle that has been a thousand times more serious—the problem of the grain gambler, and of grading the grain at the terminal elevators.

Then they complained of the diversity of price between the raw and the finished product of the farm and factory, but today, nearly three years after the armistice was signed, the diversity between the raw material and the finished products of wheat and corn are little less than criminal.

No class of farmers has suffered more from the period of reconstruction than the men who are raising cattle and sheep and hogs to feed the world. If you ask the cause, we can only tell you that the power of someone other than the producer to fix the price of the raw material and then the finished product is supreme. The

power to fix the price is the last word in the exploitation of a helpless world.

But what about these values, and the price of the things we have to sell? The measure of value, and the problem of price, are the two greatest problems of the industrial world today. Value is fixed by the cost of the raw material and the labor that goes into the thing. Thus the value of an article of commerce is simply the value of the raw material plus the cost of the labor that brought it into commercial perfection. The cost-plus theory is correct. The value of a bushel of wheat is simply the actual cost of the labor, plus every other element of cost that entered into the production of the wheat.

If it is true that the cost of any article is the cost of the raw material, plus the labor necessary for its preparation for the market, we have another problem to solve before we can fix the price, for there has never been a fixed value for labor.

The price of labor in the commercial world in this country has ever been subject to the caprice of supply and demand. In the days when the manufacturing industries were crying out for protection of their infant industries by levying a protective tariff, a tariff wall was built around this nation that permitted the manufacturers to fix the price of their products at the cost of the production plus the actual price the article cost, but while this protection was given to the manufacturers, the laborers of the nation were obliged to compete with the cheap labor of Europe, and every foreign country on the other side of the water. Competition for labor and protection for the manufacturer.

As a result of that protection, the infant industries of this nation in 1870 became the giant monopolies of 1921.

What is the value of a day's labor on the farm? Will someone answer this question? An experience of more than forty years has taught me that the value of a day's labor on the farm is the most uncertain element in the world at this time.

Farmers, have you ever kept your time in hours while you make your crop? Do you ever keep books on your farming operations? Do you make an inventory of your possessions once a year to ascertain just how many dollars you earn during the year? If you do these things, you will soon come to know just what "price" and "value" are doing for you in your commercial transactions.

In 1918, a thousand bushels of wheat were worth $3,000. Who fixed that as the price? You will no doubt tell me that this price was measured by our dollar and that the dollar is our standard of value.

Last year the same thousand bushels of wheat was only worth $1,300. The wheat was just as good, and the world's supply smaller than it was in 1918, but our dollar, that "honest dollar of our daddies," made a difference of $1,200 in the price you were obliged to take for it.

Our dollar is the nation's standard measure of value. Our yard is the standard measure of cloth, and our pound containing sixteen ounces is our fixed standard of weight. If we consult the statutes of the states we will find that the laws not only fix the standards of weight and measure, but they protect the people by stringent legislation from the use of either a scale or a measure that is in the least defective. These are honest measures, and if a merchant measured to you ten yards of print today, it would measure just ten yards one year from this time. But our "honest dollar," based on that

time-honored gold standard because of its stability of value, measured your thousand bushels of wheat in 1918 worth $3,000 and in less than two years it measured, or short-measured, the same wheat worth only $1,300.

A cry went up a year ago advising the farmers to hold their wheat for three dollars a bushel, but that dollar of our "daddies" had the upper hand, and the men who held their wheat for three dollars per bushel paid the price of a misunderstanding of the power of men to fix the price.

Space forbids my taking the time to call your attention to the many shortcomings of our dollar in the manipulation of prices in these days of reconstruction, but you have a concrete example in every community in the United States in the measure of value placed upon the farm lands. In 1918 your farm was worth $300 per acre, and in less than one year it changed its estimate of value, and put the price at $150 an acre, and no market. You borrowed money expecting to sell your corn crop at $1.50 per bushel to pay it back, but the $1,500 you thought you would pay with a thousand bushels of corn took five thousand bushels of your corn, and you had to sell hogs to pay the difference in interest.

Every farmer must learn that he is buying dollars with grain and that sometimes it takes too much human energy to produce grain enough to buy the dollars that your emergencies demand.

What is value, and how is the value of a thing fixed? Does supply and demand fix values? Will someone tell us if the supply of wheat fixes the value of that necessary article of commerce in the world today? Does supply and demand fix the value of your hog or your steer? Nearly the whole world knows at this time that they do not.

How about interest? Does supply and demand fix the rate of interest. Someone tells us that there is no money in the banks at this time, and that is the reason we cannot borrow. Can this be true? Will someone tell us where all the money has gone? Has it left the country? If it has not left the country, where is it? Less than ten years ago congress passed the Federal Reserve Bank law, with the promise that it would protect the people from the shortages of money that produce panics and hamper industry. That Federal Reserve law piloted the old ship of state through the greatest war in all history; it floated billions of dollars in the bonds of the nation and then financed our allies with a loan of ten billion dollars. Such an undertaking in other times, and under other conditions, would have shaken the foundations of this government. But after the war was over, after peace was declared, and after three years of the greatest prosperity that was ever known in any country, in any age, a curtain of the blackest financial distress that ever spread its mantle of darkness and debt and ruin over any nation on earth fell upon this nation over night, and brought in its wake bank failures, mortgage foreclosures, ruined homes, ruined fortunes, and every calamity that always follows any disturbance of the money of a country.

Business men and farmers everywhere cried out in their desperation, "Where has all the money gone?" The country banks everywhere appealed to the Federal Reserve banks for relief, but they appealed in vain; interest rates soared up to the legal limit, and even then we found no relief; usury laws were disregarded, and the prices of products went so low as to demoralize industry; labor, out of employment, cried out for the right to earn a living, but their cry was never heeded.

Students of economics, and thinking men in every walk of life, are asking for the cause of this blight of the nation's industries that came almost over night. Every effect must have an underlying first cause. Recognizing this fact of economics, there is but one question, and that question is, Where lies the fault? Tell us, wise men of business! What broke the power of the Federal Reserve system after the heavy load of the great war was relaxed? Was there less money in the country after the war than before? If we had the same amount of money in existence after the war, why was it not kept at work exchanging the so much needed products of industry?

Without attempting an explanation, I want to raise some questions for the purpose of provoking investigation and inquiry. Will someone answer the question, "Why, with thirteen Federal Reserve Banks in the nation, was there possible such unity of action when the moment arrived to bring on the nation-wide stringency?" Then will someone tell the people whether the critical financial stringency we are passing through is the result of natural causes over which no one had possible control, or was it brought about by the organized bankers of the nation with the power of the Federal Banks as a working head, for gain? Is it a possible fact that the bankers saw that the harvest was already ripe, and ready for the reapers, and with one accord the cry of contraction was sent out, and then the crop of past due paper and the government bonds in the hands of men and women of small means was harvested while the nation groaned under the unjust burdens that such a policy is sure to bring? Failing to answer these questions, the bankers of this nation will for a hundred years rest under a suspicion that they were directly re-

sponsible for the stringency of money and the destruction of credit that inevitably spread industrial ruin into every section of the nation.

Thinking men know that there is not a better organized business in the world today than the organized bankers of the country. They tremble when they contemplate the power of such an organization. The business of the bankers of the nation is the gathering of interest, and when they contemplate that the nation in its individual capacity, and as individuals and corporation, is at this time paying more than $5,000,000,000 interest alone annually, and then that the budget of national expenses is the same, they tremble for the safety of the great army of men and women who labor to produce this awful mountain of wealth.

Again we ask, could our financiers have averted the disaster? These are questions that the bankers of this nation should answer in such a manner as to be within the understanding of the commonest man of the world.

Industrial peace! Who can fix the price of industrial peace? Will it come while it is still possible for some unseen power to crush one-half the value out of every farm, every city home, every bushel of wheat, every hog and steer and cow, as well as every species of property, within thirty days by hiding the money of the country and refusing to loan the very lifeblood of the industrial world? Will industrial peace be possible while a few men sitting around a table and calling themselves "The Board of Trade" can say every day what the producers—that great army of farmers—may have for their corn and their wheat? Will industrial peace be possible while the wage workers of the world are obliged to depend for both the work and wage upon an organized army of manufacturers whose business it is to convert

raw material into the finished product for gain? Will it be possible ever to attain industrial peace while the distribution of the products of labor is controlled by an organized trade, and while the cost of every article of commerce is protected by law in its trade secrets? When these questions have been answered, and not till then, will we be on the way to a just solution of industrial problems.

Organized labor has fought for fifty years for the right to a living wage, with no other weapon than the strike, and their cause is still in a state of chaos. The agriculturalists and the laborers have been little considered in the nation's problems of industry. Nothing points to this with more force than the facts shown by the appropriations of congress. The present congress appropriated for the army $392,559,000, for the navy $443,279,000, for pensions $279,150,000. Think of it! One billion one hundred and five million dollars for an army and for the support of the victims of such a policy of ruin as militarism brings, and only the pittance of $30,712,000 for agriculture.

Our law makers forgot that the farmers of this nation went out into the undeveloped prairies of the great west to subdue the soil, and prepare it for the homes of the millions who should come after them. Do they not know that they went ahead of the railroads, and the markets, and the schools, and the churches, and with a courage born of desperation built their humble homes? Have they forgotten that the work these pioneers did was then, and is now, essential to the very life of the nation? Do they not know that in spite of the drought, and the grasshoppers, and the blizzards, and the usurers, and the mortgages, they produced enough of this world's goods to feed an army several times their num-

ber? Do they not know that after fifty years of toil on the farm and in the factory, the great mass of workers are crying out that they are still unfed and unclothed, and some remedy must be found for the solution of the problem of industrial war that has well-nigh prostrated every energy of this nation for fifty years?

What is to be the price of industrial peace in this nation and the world? Who can answer this momentous question? Have we not for a thousand years preached the doctrine of competition, and must we not admit that from the country grocery to the great trusts that control the industries of nations there is now no such thing as competition? Competition is the strife of beasts. It has no place in the affairs of a Christian people.

Has the world not come to know that there is no problem so intricate that its solution cannot be found under God? These problems must be solved. They can be solved, and the solution must be found in some righteous stabilization of industry. If prices were stable, industry would be at peace. Everything in a commercial nation must depend upon price. Can we longer depend upon that fallacy of a by-gone generation called "supply and demand"? Does it work in this age of organization? It does not, and if this is true, we must find some other means of solving the problem. The question of price is the beginning of the final adjustment that must be made before the world can hope for the beginning of industrial peace, and it must be considered as it relates to the products of labor in every field of industry, and as it relates to labor for wage.

A Living Wage

Because the whole problem of price relates to labor, we shall treat labor first under the subject of "A Living Wage".

The claim to a living wage is a natural right. This claim is absolute. The basic principle of the right of a living wage is the right to live from the fruits of the earth. This right is fundamental. It is acknowledged by every civilized nation of the earth. It is insisted upon by Christian people everywhere. The right to a living wage is superior to any right of private property. The Christian ethics of this generation tell the rich man that the superfluous bread, and shoes, and clothing in his possession belongs to his hungry and naked neighbors. More than this. The alms given by the rich to the poor are simply the payment of a debt. The title to private property as well as common property is constituted in the primary principle of human needs.

Every man has a right to live as a man, and not as an animal, says a noted economist. He must have food and shelter, as well as opportunity for physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual uplift. The whole theory of a laborer's right to a living wage is simply the right to a decent living.

Every commodity produced by man has a certain and a fair valuation. This valuation must be entirely independent of any valuation that comes from higgling markets.

Who is to say what the just price of any given commodity shall be? We are taught that every article of the commercial world has a specific labor cost. If this doctrine is right, then the basis of value is the cost in labor. This seems to be a true statement, but someone rises to assert that a just wage is the wage that men actually pay in the strife of competitive bargaining.

Have the laborers of this nation not had enough of the application of competitive bargaining? Have they not for a hundred years been in a most unrighteous com-

petition with the underpaid and underfed labor of Europe? Have they not paid their share to the support of the nation while these underfed laborers have come to our shores to compete with American workmen under our tariff-protected industries?

A living wage is the road to the only righteous reconstruction possible and it must be made the first charge upon industry, and not until that question is settled may the question of dividends be considered. Such a program would forever settle the question of strikes, and would disband every commonwealth army as soon as it was being organized.

The old Roman law said: "A man has a right to do with his own what he pleases." The new interpretation of property rights says, "The bounty of nature was created for all, and no man has a right to curb or destroy this fundamental right of society." The Christian doctrine of ownership is stewardship. Every man or woman who performs a function in the organization of industry, the lord of the land, the tenant, the master-craftsman, the journeyman, the apprentice, renders to society a special service. For that service he has special rights. These rights extend to the bounty of the earth, and no man has a right to dispute them.

Will any man still insist that a minimum of state regulation means a maximum of freedom to the individual? This doctrine is false in theory and false in practice. Political and legal freedom are not a sufficient safeguard to the welfare of the individual in these times of organized power. The power that a perfect freedom gives exposes a man and his family to the exactions of a heartless competitive system that knows no moderation. The history of the nineteenth century as it relates to the wage system furnishes overwhelming

proof of the wisdom and the necessity of a government-fixed minimum wage. Until recently only a few economists have been found that would favor a wage by law, but at this time there are many of the best thinkers in America who insist that it is the only solution to this perplexing problem. We have ventured to apply a minimum wage to women and to children, but we have not yet extended that principle to adult male laborers.

Every unbiased observer today realizes that an underpaid worker can be lifted out of his condition of poverty only by some method of legal enactment for his protection.

We are ready to assert that the state is morally bound to compel employers to pay a living wage, and it must be promptly put in force by appropriate legislation.

But we must not forget that a minimum wage places upon the back of labor a new obligation. It is the obligation to assure to the employer a just return for that living wage. Nothing less than this would appeal to the justice of the demand for a living wage, and nothing less would be advocated or tolerated. If organized labor can ever hope to win and hold an honorable place in the hearts of the American people they must frown upon any attempt to render less than the most efficient service in return for the living wage that is demanded, and this must be safeguarded by the labor organizations before they can have any right to legal protection from the state.

What would such a law do? It would improve industrial conditions; it would put into the hearts of labor a new hope—the hope that springs eternal in the human breast; it would remove the plague spots of our cities; it would divide the number of divorces by two; it would remove the necessity for child labor, and put these inno-

cent victims of our wage system into the schools; it would be the beginning of a program of home-building that would solve the problem of tenancy; it would close the doors of our legalized usurers, and destroy the business of the dollar-a-week men in our cities who have fattened on the God-given hunger for the good things of life that have been sold to them at a hundred per cent of profit and an almost certain failure of final title to the goods; it would bring the employers of labor to consider Christian ethics, instead of modern day business ethics, in their treatment and employment of labor; in short, it would lay the foundation of righteousness and justice as the first principle of an enduring industrial peace in the world.

In the discussion of the question as it relates to labor, we have covered the question as it relates to the laborers for wages on the farms, but we must still discuss that all-important question as it relates to the production of the raw materials of agriculture.

Because this question so vitally touches the very foundations of civilized society, we approach it with more than ordinary misgivings. Price as it relates to the farmers of this nation is the last word in the problem of industrial peace. For more than fifty years the unorganized, unprotected farmers have been the victims of that heartless combination of men known as "The Board of Trade," "The Wheat Pit," and "The Bucket Shop," of Chicago. They have petitioned congress, they have plead with political parties, but their appeals have never been heeded. For more than twenty-five years they have charged that under the operation of this organization the price of wheat has been regulated in such a manner as to force it down while the tenant farmers and those in immediate need of money were

obliged to sell. By some unseen power of regulation they have been able to realize immense fortunes on their futures in the autumn and in some instances, single individuals have been credited with reaping more profit in a single season than all the farmers of a great state could realize from a year's crop. The farmers are crying out for relief from the power of the gamblers in the foodstuffs of the people.

The power of these gamblers has not been seriously questioned for fifty years. It has been called every unsavory name known to the vocabulary of the politicians who every four years go about telling the people how to save the country, but there has never been a single enactment of congress that even raised a hope in the hearts of the American farmers that something tangible was about to be done.

When a public service corporation finds its business unprofitable it cries out to the courts for relief, and the courts respond by raising the rates they may charge the people for service. When the farmers complain that their farming operations are not remunerative, they are fed on that old story of overproduction. It is hard to make them understand that if the courts have the right to protect the corporation in keeping rates high enough to bring a remunerative return on the investment, they cannot have relief from the same unfortunate condition.

You may talk of the regulation of that powerful combination of grain gamblers, but there is only one remedy that will bring to the farmers of this nation any permanent relief, and that remedy is to be found in a guaranteed, standardized minimum price for the products of the farm. That price should be high enough to insure to every farmer a fair value for every day's labor entering into the raising of a bushel of standard wheat.

This price must be ascertained by the method of the price-plus.

We would not at this time advocate a minimum price on all the products of the farm, but we would advocate a minimum price on every bushel of wheat and on every pound of cotton and sugar that the farmers of the nation brought into existence of standards, approved for storage, by the government.

We are aware that this is a new doctrine, but we invite the most thoughtful and candid consideration of the entire problem as we try in a very crude manner to make it clear.

Another thought must be considered in the question of stabilization by standardization of the price of these essential farm products. It has been thought by some that this great nation extending as it does from the Great Lakes on the north to the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and from the Atlantic on the east to the Pacific on the west, is in little danger of a shortage of the products of the farm essential to the life of the people. This may be true, but we must not forget that the only unit from which a wise nation can consider the peace and security of mankind in these days is the whole world. Every community of the Old World is at this time overcrowded. Scarcely a single nation of the Old World can produce enough of the essentials of life for the support of its people. It has been said that if the breadstuffs were withheld from England for thirty days a condition of starvation would face its people.

This nation cannot live alone. It cannot forget its obligations to humanity. It did not forget them in a time of war, and in the past it has remembered them in times of peace. It is true that at this moment we are living in an attitude of isolation, and following out a defiant policy that refuses to consider any other unit of

peace than our national unit of super-dominance, but would any wise husbandman think for a moment of closing his eyes to the possibility of a national disaster such as any reasoning man must admit might come to this nation in the shape of a shortage of breadstuffs or the raw material for the clothes to keep us warm?

Our country has never considered this question from that standpoint, but the time has come for just such a consideration, and the reasons as well. The first reason for such a consideration is the possibility of some future calamity, either in this nation or in the world that would compel us to face a shortage of breadstuffs. For this reason, if for no other, we should take steps to provide for such an emergency.

How could this be done? We will answer. With an annual surplus of wheat this nation is simply living from hand to mouth. No provision has ever been made for the storage of enough of our annual bread crop to feed the nation for one year, if such a calamity were to befall us. We would provide enough great terminal elevators for the storage of wheat at points easily accessible to the grain sections of the country, and then we would store enough of our surplus wheat every year to provide for any shortage that might occur. To provide for storing this wheat we would standardize the minimum price of number one and number two wheat, and at that price we would fill these elevators every year at the minimum price so fixed. If the fixed minimum price failed to purchase sufficient wheat for storage, we would raise the price to a point that would bring the wheat, if there was a surplus of wheat above the nation's needs. When a new crop was assured, we would sell the stored wheat whenever it would bring a price that would reimburse the government for the money paid, or we would hold it for another year.

A standardized price for wheat would mean that when the farmers planted they would be obliged to take only the hazards of the season. This nation would never again be disgraced by ungodly gambling in the sweat of human toil, for this is the only effective solution to the crime of gambling in wheat.

In the same manner we would standardize the great cotton and sugar crops of the nation, and thus protect the labor that goes into the production of these necessities of our lives, necessities so essential to the comfort and happiness of the human family.

Let no man assert that this undertaking is too great for this government. The amount of money needed to store every bushel of the surplus wheat, and this is all that we would think of storing, would simply be negligible. Every bushel of wheat and every pound of flour exported in 1920 was only $306,000,000. Our exports of cotton goods amounted to $364,000,000 and our exports of raw cotton amounted to the sum of $1,381,000,000.

Standardization of the price of both wheat and cotton would raise the price in the markets of the world, our farmers would be the beneficiaries, and we would simply be encouraging the manufacture of the surplus cotton and then instead of selling raw cotton, we would send to the markets of the world the finished product.

We have already stated that labor is fundamental in the affairs of the world. Industrial peace can never come to this country, nor can it come to the world, until the right to labor and the right to a living wage shall be realized by every citizen of the Republic. The Christian conscience of this nation will never be at rest until the problems of labor are settled in a manner so righteous to all concerned as to merit the approval of all people and of God.

Is someone about to say that we already have legal means of settling the disputes between capital and labor and there is nothing left to do? Nothing could be farther from the truth than this statement. As I write there is impending one of the greatest conflicts between these great economic forces that has ever been staged in the history of the world. While these forces are agitating their theories of adjustments, the people, that great third party to every controversy between capital and labor, who in every struggle have borne the burdens of the conflict, as well as the losses in money and time, are still crying out for some righteous solution to this problem that for a century has so ruthlessly disturbed the industrial world and kept business unsettled.

There is only one remedy that gives promise of bringing industrial peace, and that remedy is to be found in the standardization of every grade of employment that can be exploited by the competitive system, by fixing a minimum wage.

There is only one way to crush the bucket shops in their skillful speculation and manipulation of the foodstuffs of the world, and the cotton products of the southland, and that way is through a standardization of the price of these commodities.

In a spirit of righteousness a minimum wage can be fixed that will bring to the wage laborers of the nation perfect security, and at the same time forever settle the strikes that have so long disturbed the peace of the world.

Just as certainly as the nations of the world must find some way to settle contentions and disputes that threaten war, just as certainly the industrial peace of the world must be secured before industrial peace can come to this nation.

Chapter X

THE PERIL OF AMERICAN CITIES

Among the many unsolved problems of this nation and its twentieth century civilization is the problem of our congested centers of national life.

Populations amassed in great centers cannot live in obscurity. They must stand out as the centers from which must radiate the best and the worst of our civilization. They are indeed the battlegrounds and, in a great measure, the determining factors of our moral progress.

Congestion of peoples in large centers has been a marked tendency of all history. It has not been confined to christian nations, but they have been found as well in the teeming populations of Ninnevah, Babylon, Carthage, Syracuse, and Rome.

History teaches us that highly civilized countries have furnished the greatest centralization of population, and this has been accelerated with every year of advance of our complex civilization.

These large aggregations of population have been the most remarkable in this country, because our inhabitants have been spreading out into great expanses of new territory, organizing new communities, building new cities, but in spite of all the wonderful growth of the cities of the world, ours has been more wonderful than the cities in the countries of the Old World.

But the increase in city population as compared with the increase in country population has been phenominal, and it has been the greatest concern of the economists of our times.

At the opening of this century only six communities of 8,000 population and over were registered in the cities, and at this time in several states the city population far outnumbers the country, while in the entire country it is estimated that it will reach and may far exceed 60 per cent.

The increase in city population in the last decade has been alarming. New York City increased in the last decade more than 39 per cent; Detroit increased 60 per cent; Passaic New York increased 90 per cent; Los Angeles increased 201 per cent, while Oklahoma City increased over five hundred per cent.

Increase in the population of our cities is not the only concern. A greater concern is the increase in the foreign population. Not only has the foreign population greatly increased, but far more alarming is its set determination to collect in the great commercial centers.

In New Egnland alone, as far back as 1910, they had in the cities one million eight hundred sixty-five thousand nine hundred ninety-three foreign born, and born of foreign parents, and at the same time in the rural districts of the same class only one hundred eighty-six thousand eight hundred sixteen, and in the New England states the ratio of foreign citizens in the cities as compared to the country was ten to one.

In every section of this country a large per cent of the population of the larger cities is made up of foreigners, and in some instances it totals more than seventy-five per cent of the entire population.

These conditions are true only in America. In the old world no such condition exists. The city problem is not one of theirs. Their populations are homogeneous. They speak the same language. They have the same ideals. They honor the same flag, and this renders the

problem of their governments more simple. In London, the second city of the world, only 2 per cent of the people were born outside the British Isles.

But the worst is not yet told. The foreign populations of which we speak come from every country on earth. As we scan the pages of history we are unable to read of any nation so exposed to the perils of an unassimilated foreign population as that to which this nation is exposed at this time, and this is rendered the more dangerous because this force is so concentrated as to render it more effective.

What a polygot of population! I ask, "Can the old world subjects be transformed into new world citizens under the conditions we have just related? Can we assimilate these subjects of old world misrule, or must we be assimilated by them?"

These questions suggest a phase of our national life that deserves our most patriotic consideration. Not next year, but NOW.

I have pointed out the alarming increase in the city population and I have called attention to the fact that a large per cent of that increase is foreigners, but I now wish to call to the attention of America the alarming peril that today threatens this country in the political power in these cities made up so largely of unassimilated foreigners. Have we not come to understand that the cities of our country have come to be the very touchstone and the Gordian knot of the government? Our cities are assuming alarming proportions, and they are bringing to the people grave perplexities.

"The city has always been the center of all the great aggregations of wealth. Business is its god. All men are its constituents, if they are within its reach. Its unity of purpose is unbroken, and its identity of inter-

ests is complete. It is the center of commercial power. It is the home of that great throng of restless, roving, adventurous class of needy, greedy men and women who have come there to shun the light of public gaze. In the walls of the modern city are the concentrated vices of the world. Within its borders, crime multiplies and thrives, gambling hells flourish unnoticed, lechery runs riot, and the slums and babels of confusion beat back law and order, while poverty and wretchedness are a stench in the nostrils of the world, and a disgrace to our civilization."

If the city is, as has been suggested, the battleground of our civilization and religion, then we must emphasize the necessity for safeguards. We must come to understand that these aggregations of un-Americanized foreigners that exert their influence in the city to the city's peril, also make that influence felt in the government of the state, and through the state the same influence reaches into the nation.

Just what is that power at this time? In ancient history Ninnevah was a synonym for Assyria, Athens for Greece, Rome for Italy, and their civilizations rose and fell with them, but in America where the laws are the expression of the mind of the people, their dominence is most mercenary.

Must we be compelled to say in America, "All roads lead to New York," as they said in Italy "All roads lead to Rome?" Must the people of Illinois say, "All roads lead to Chicago," and must every state in the Union be compelled to say, "All roads lead to the metropolis," Is self-interest to rule the state through the power of the cities to control the law-making bodies of the state, If the cities of the state even hold the balance of power at the polls, what is to hinder them from

casting their votes together to accomplish any given purpose.

Well may the question be asked, "What is the influence of our cities in the state and in the nation?" That question cannot be answered until the people understand the power of that influence that has been wielded so many times in the political life of America we call "The balance of power." That influence is positive because it can control election results. It is pernicious because it will not elect men who will forget personal interests, or interests of political groups, and make laws for the good of the entire community.

For a century Bartholdi has stood in New York harbor, beckoning to the oppressed of all nations to come to our shores and enjoy the " liberty that enlightens the world." The invitation has been accepted, and the teeming millions have flocked to our shores from every nation on earth. This is not the whole story. These foreigners have settled in great communities, both in city and country, speaking their native tongue and perpetuating the customs of the fatherland. Their children are raised in the environment of corruption and vice. Their churches have sent their ministers to establish schools for perpetuating the language as well as the religion and the customs of the fatherland. So strong have these communities come to be that great papers have been established in America, printed in the language of these several nationalities, that go to them as exponents of their interpretation of liberty and freedom and the right promised by "Religious Liberty" under our constitution and our laws. Their schools have been established where their language and their religion have been taught, and out of these schools the population is being swelled not only by new citizens trained in the

ideals of the fatherland, but sometimes new citizens taught to rebel against the spirit of our American institutions, instead of citizens schooled in a love of the liberty and freedom that was the inheritance of every American youth.

Group political action is a crime against a free government, but when the groups represent alignments of foreigners whose ideals of American life are the building up of communities of their own bloods and speaking their own language, and living up to their own ideals, and obeying the laws that they endorse, and disobeying those that in their conception seem to trample upon their ideas of what is meant by freedom and liberty, then it is time America awaken and make plain that this great free nation cannot be foreignized by any grouping of foreigners. No little Bohemias or Germanys or any other foreign group should be permitted to mar the landscapes of America or to disturb its moral or social life by trying to bring with them to this nation to be planted upon our free soil anything that is even flavored with an un-American spirit.

Out of these conditions in our cities came the two great contending forces we call capital and labor. Individual capital disappeared in the great corporations and individual labor in the trade union. Both organized for protection. What does all this mean? Force against force. Capital for profits, and labor for the right to live. Here again the problem of the city becomes the problem of mankind, and it perplexes us.

This is an awful picture of America as it is today. The menace that such a condition brings is not overdrawn. We must impress upon the world that American institutions demand American ideals, and that American ideals cannot be impressed in any foreign

tongue. "America for Americans" must be the slogan of this generation, and we must make the world understand that when any foreigner comes to our shores, the moment he is under the jurisdiction of our courts and the protection of Old Glory, he must begin to qualify himself for citizenship in this great Republic. And not this alone. We must see to it that no man or woman is clothed with the right to vote, or otherwise exercise the rights of an American citizen, until he can do so intelligently. This accomplished, the menace of the city would vanish like dews before a summer sun.

Can we afford to allow the standards of American citizenship to be lowered by corruption in our cities or by the refusal of our foreign population to Americanize? Again, is it safe to listen to the demands of foreigners upon any policy that we might pursue in our national affairs, when such demands are certain to represent un-American ideals?

American voters beware. If the cities of a state can at this time dictate the policies of that state, such a power is a real peril.

The moral standards of the city must be raised, and its voters must get the spirit of American institutions and show a disposition to give expression of that spirit in a righteous vote at the ballot box.

Who can tell just what the power that we have called the "balance of power" is, as it is expressed in the state as well as in the nation? The commercial interests of the city are widely different from the interests of the small towns and the country. Suppose that in voting upon a given question the towns and cities of the state would decide to cast their votes for any contention of the city. Who would win? The question might be a question of the gravest moment, and the expression of

the verdict so rendered might work to the harm of the entire nation.

But attention to the government of the cities should be the first consideration. Everywhere the cities have been clamoring for Home Rule. They want to get from under the domination of the state in the making of the laws that govern them. In many of the states their appeals have been heard. The arguments for "Home Rule" sound well as they are sent out to the world, but just at this time this nation is getting a concrete example of the dangers of the principles of "Home Rule." Are the people not interested in the government of the great commercial centers where every transaction in the exchange of the products of the rural communities must be effected? We sometimes forget that we should be vitally interested and we forget, too, that the influence the city is certain to exercise, either directly or indirectly, over us might be very prejudicial to our best interests, and because of this we must be alert and watchful that our protection may be made certain.

The public opinion of the city is simply the mind of the city either expressed or seeking expression in law. This may be either good or bad, and in this way alone we can measure the real influence of the city upon the state.

The commercialism of our time demands a "wide-open"city. What is a wide-open city? A wide-open city simply means that the city government and the business interests must recognize the right of every enterprise within its jurisdiction to prosper. The city invites business of every character from every quarter of the globe. It cannot deny the gamblers, the ward heelers, the prostitutes, and the men who in these days of constitutional prohibition, the bootleggers, to settle within its borders.

All these classes of undesirables help to elect the officers and dictate the policies of the modern city.

Does anyone wonder that the modern city wants "Home Rule"? Would the people of the state be justified in concluding that the city of the future would be less dangerous to the morals of the people than the city of today?

Are the people of the state interested in the government of our cities? Is not the average city a real menace to the morals of the young men of the state? Is it not a fact that a "wide open" city with its friendly police furnishes or winks at the gambling hells and houses of prostitution that ruin the innocent young manhood of the state and cheat them out of every dollar they may have in their possession? Do not our cities under constitutional prohibition boast of the fact that liquor is easy to those who know the combination, and do not the police wink at the crimes that must come under their observation every day and night?

This nation must come to realize the peril of our cities, both from the standpoint of their political power as well as their disposition and determination to disrespect the laws of their country.

"Home Rule" is the child of the agitation for the "wide-open" city, and the wide-open city is the home of more crime and more criminals than disgrace all the balance of the states outside the cities.

What is the influence of the cities in the election of the officers of the state and especially those officers who are charged with the making of our laws? I assert again that its influence is both positive and pernicious. It is positive because it is so organized as to control votes, and it is pernicious because it will not elect men who will vote for laws that make for the uplift of the people.

Upon this point Theodore Roosevelt, who was during his life perhaps the best qualified authority upon this question, speaking of the menaces of the city to the government before the Congregational Club of New York City, said: "In any attempt to reform them by law we would find nine-tenths of the city members in the legislature hostile. The only hope of reform lies in the country members. The average grade of our politicians is a menace to good government. Four-fifths of the members elected as representatives from New York and Brooklyn can be depended upon to vote on the wrong side of every question."

But the menace of the city in the life of this republic is still more far-reaching than its influence in government such as we have pointed out. In the city we find the great aggregations of wealth. Wealth is power. It is labor stored up in portable form. It is a charged battery of social force. It holds the power to command labor. In every form it is organized, and its influence is felt in factories, whose wheels and spindles are today doing the work that only a few years ago must be done by the hands of men.

The great aggregations of people in the cities are there to work. They came to America with false impressions of the meaning of liberty as we know it in American life. To them it has meant license instead of liberty under the law. This is the most dangerous force in the Republic today, and a thousand times more dangerous because of the organized power of the cities in every state to control elections.

Do the people not yet understand how vital to American life and American ideals is the question of Americanization? Do they not understand that if these foreign elements can so dominate the elections in cities as

to get control in our legislatures, its pernicious influence might write laws that would imperil our civilization and set it back a hundred years?

Have we not come to know the dangers of "wide-open" cities and "wide-open" saloons? Is the eighteenth amendment to our constitution to be held in such disrespect in our cities as to bring the blush of shame to liberty-loving, law-abiding citizens? The spirit of Home Rule and the "wide-open" city are standing today in open defiance of our constitution.

We must Americanize. The government of every city in our land must be made to understand that the constitution must be respected, and the laws must be obeyed, whether they measure up to the city's ideals or not.

There is in America today a general contempt for law, and in our cities that contempt is showing its spirit in such bold defiance as to belittle the authority that created it and render it a sham and a counterfeit. Laxity and delays in administration have bred in the public mind a spirit of the most vicious contempt of law. We have emphasized man's rights and ignored his duties. Society, in its wild debauch of freedom, is throwing its heritage to the winds and turning its drunken debauch into darkness. The very foundations of the primitive institutions of mankind, like the church, and the school, and the family, and the state, have been shaken, and are trembling between restitution by rebuilding and ruin by stagnation.

Where is all this lawlessness to end? Must we forget the city in our moral calculations, or shall we bring that spirit of lawlessness to its knees, and build in these "Sodoms and Gomorrows" new ideals, and a new life? The city's atmosphere of vile odors must be cleansed, and the cities of our nation must be made to understand

that the eighteenth amendment as an important part of the law of the land must be enforced in a spirit of American patriotism.

Will anyone say that the eighteenth amendment was not intended for complete enforcement? Was that amendment, written into our constitution after a century of bitter contention, intended simply to apply to the poor man, while the rich and the powerful go scot-free? Is the much-talked-of law enforcement to apply only to the poor man, while a rich offender with thousands of dollars worth of liquor in his cellar is permitted to go free?

This cannot be. A double standard of law enforcement in this country will never be tolerated. The same law that brings a poor man into court must apply itself with equal vigor and with the same honesty to the rich, and there must be no camaflouge to deceive the people.

What is said here does not simply apply to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, but it must also apply to the enforcement of all laws that every day must be enforced against the rich and the poor.

How long can the contending forces in America continue to contend for mastery? When will the people come to understand that the questions raised by these forces are not questions for the city alone, but questions in which the entire country is vitally interested?

When will America awaken to the fact that an un-Americanized population is a menace to our republic? When will they analyze the power of the organized cities, and the dangers that are made possible through the large aggregations of foreigners within their gates?

The world war brought to the American mind a real awakening on the problem of Americanization. We have drifted along for years seeking political advantage

through group political action. Everybody knows that the threat of political action has forced both the dominant political parties into the gravest errors. No party has been free from its influences. It has exchanged promises of special privileges for the votes of groups both racial and commercial, and thus aided in solidifying the foreign vote for things that were not in accord with our American ideals.

Group alignments for political power are wrong. No man who will give his sanction to the demands of special groups should be allowed to sit in any legislative body in a republic. Men who are not big enough to get the vision of an entire nation and to cast their votes independent of any alignment or promise are not worthy a seat in any legislative body in the republic.

We have said some plain words about the cities, and about the foreigners within their gates and their refusal to Americanize. What we have said does not relate to Americanized foreigners whose citizenship and patriotism have ever been above reproach, but it does relate to those communities where, being overwhelmingly foreign, those groups are able and determined to impress their language and their customs upon the communities where they have such power.

We have given the industrious foreigners from every country a royal welcome to our shores. We have seen their teeming multitudes flock to our shores to find homes out on the great undeveloped prairies of the west, and they have brought with them a splendid spirit of honesty, industry and thrift. They left their homes in the old world and found new homes on the free soil of America. They built here their happy homes. They prospered in this land of opportunity. They left the fatherland to make homes in free America, because they

loved our liberty and our freedom. Nothing could have been more natural than that kindred peoples in a foreign land would segregate themselves into communities and then that they should speak the language of the fatherland. They loved America. They loved its institutions. They loved it because they knew that here they could make homes for their children, after they had passed away.

No patriotic American will unjustly judge his brother because of his ancestry, but the foreigners within our gates must be generous enough to know that in a foreign land they owe a certain deference and an *unquestioned* patriotism to the land of their adoption.

Foreigners! This is your adopted country. You must never forget that. The liberties you enjoy and the opportunities that have been yours have come to you by the grace of our free institutions, and we have a right to demand that you help us to keep the doors of American opportunity open for your children and for ours. You must get the spirit of American ideals. You must learn to speak and read our language. You must learn that the liberties of which we are so proud cannot license wrong. You must help us to make America in fact what it has so long been in name, "The land of the free and the home of the brave."

Foreigners! You cannot show your good faith and your undying patriotism in a way that will bring you into more friendly relations with your American brothers than to adopt, and not antagonize American ideals. This nation cannot be foreignized. Old Glory must continue to wave over a people in full sympathy with every ideal of America, and when any foreigner finds himself out of sympathy with those ideals he should immediately emigrate to the country whose ideals he loves.

Cities of America! You have enjoyed great prosperity. Your wealth has increased until it is phenominal. Your political and commercial power is indeed great. Your industrial problems are complex. You have boasted that your prosperity was an index to the prosperity of the state and the nation. This should not be true. The real prosperity of a country should be reflected in the splendor of its great agricultural districts, in the beauty of their homes, and in the contentment that should be reflected in the permanency and beauty of those homes and their home life.

The cities of this nation must be reminded that their problems are not the problems of the great cities of the world. The population of our cities represent an amalgamation of the populations of the world. The ideals of government and the conceptions of freedom are here contending for mastery. The greatest danger in the American city, and we may say as well in the entire nation, is disregard and disobedience of the law. Must this nation be compelled to apologize for an absolute disrespect for law in our cities? Let us beware. If a republic can hope to live it must respect the laws of the state under which it lives. Here again the American city must face the problem of the foreign population. There is only one solution to the problem of our foreign populations, and the solution to that problem is to be found in a speedy compulsory Americanization of every foreigner the moment he comes to our shores. When we have accomplished this in every section of America we will be able to see the beginning of a real christian democracy, and not till then.

Chapter XI

THE PROBLEM OF OVER-RICHES
OR
THE HANDICAP OF POVERTY

I ask the young men of America, what promises have you of a start in life? After you have lived your first twenty-one years under the parental roof, after you have reached your majority, and are ready to go out into the world to make a place for yourself, will your father be able to give you a few hundred dollars and a father's blessing, or will you be obliged to start at the bottom without a cent? If you have an education, you ought to be proud of it, and you ought to thank your parents for this much of a start in life, but much as you will need an education, if you are not schooled in some technical work you will find it no small task to apply it to the earning of a living. If you have secured a technical education, you are fitted to begin life at a fixed salary. This will mean that you must work for someone at a price that will be fixed by him, and even though your wages are good, you will soon discover that after your living is paid, little will be left. You will hope for the day when you may have enough to start a little home of your own, where you can bring a bride to be its queen. This is God's way of life and it is right, but how soon will you be ready to start that home? Will it be this year, or will you have to wait another before you will feel that you are ready to assume the responsibilities of the head of a family? Aye, you are waiting for that time. You have not succeeded in laying by enough to marry, and your prospective bride is waiting, too.

How different is your condition from your school friend John Jones. At his majority his father was able to take him into his business worth half a million dollars. He built a splendid home for his bride, and is comfortably settled in life. You are beginning to philosophize on the doctrine of ownership. The handicap of poverty is a real yoke upon your neck, and when you see John and his happy bride, surrounded by all the comforts and luxuries of life, when you compare his condition with yours, you would not be human if you did not feel that the fates that compelled you to begin at the bottom, while your old school friend was able to start with a comfortable fortune, was an unfair handicap at the very beginning of the race of life. You have run many a race in your school days, but you never entered a race with such a handicap as this.

But this is not all the good fortune that awaits John. He starts well in the race, but he can look ahead, secure in the promise of a rich inheritance when his father passes away. You have been born in the environment of poverty, he in the environment of wealth and luxury. To you, life is a struggle from the beginning; to John, it is a path strewn with roses from the day he assumes manhood's estate until the end of life.

What is this handicap doing for the human family? It is driving our young men away from the responsibilities of home building, and it is compelling young womanhood to seek fields of remunerative employment for self-support, instead of finding a place as the mother and queen of a happy home.

It is doing more than this. Every year the handicap is becoming greater. Every year the doors of opportunity are being closed to a larger number of our youth than were closed the year before. Every year the han-

dicap of poverty is fixing new obstacles to the getting of a start in life, as well as keeping it after it has once been in your possession.

We have boasted that this is a land of opportunity. At a time in our history this boast was one of which every American might well be proud, but today, in the face of our brutal commercialism, our industrial grafting, and our tribute-levying trusts, opportunity for the man who must start at the bottom is forever lost, unless radical changes are made in our system.

But why bemoan a fate the remedy for which lies at our very door? Let us again open the doors of opportunity so wide, and fasten them so firmly to the walls of eternal truth, that never again in our history can they be closed against the honest toilers of the land.

Are you asking, "How can this be done?" Listen, ye toilers of the land! This nation's wealth is of your own creation. If any man claims more of it than he could earn by honest toil, and honest effort, his claim is without an element of justice. The law of ownership as it is written in the ethics of God's eternal truth will not permit a man to have more of this world's goods than he can earn, nor more than he can use if he lives a righteous life.

Thinking men today agree that the first step in the direction of a solution to the problem of over-riches is some lawful means of restoring to the people the vast fortunes that have been extorted from them by special privileges. I said, "lawful means," for the laws have ever respected the right of a child to inherit whatever property the parent leaves at his death, but we must ask whether in the light of the large fortunes that today seem to threaten the very life of this republic, is it not time we began to question the right of inheritance and

the wisdom of a policy of allowing large estates to remain in the ownership of one family? Yes, the time has come when this question must be considered by the economists of this nation, and the question of the disposition of these vast accumulations of wealth must be settled in such a manner as to consider, not only the rights of those who under our present laws claim them, but also from the broader and more humane claims of the public who have done the manual labor to produce the wealth.

"Nothing is implied in property," says John Stuart Mills, "but the right of each to his or her own faculties, to what he can produce by them, and to whatever he can get for them in a fair market." It follows, therefore, that "Although the right of bequest or gift after death forms part of the idea of property, the right of inheritance, as distinguished from bequest does not." Bequest in a primitive state of society was seldom recognized, but the feudal family has long passed. Property is now inherent in individuals, not in families. The parent has the right, the power under the law, to disinherit his own children and leave his fortune to strangers.

The reason assigned by modern society for giving the property of a person who dies intestate to the children or relatives is the supposition that in doing so the law is more likely than in any other way to do what the proprietor would have done.

But the conditions that prevailed at the time of Mr. Mills, are not the conditions that prevail at this time as they relate to property, the ownership of which was not disputed. At this time we are facing the problem of untold millions, which represent the accumulations, not of honest effort, but of special privilege, and organ-

ized commercial exploitation. The right of any man to own these great fortunes is questioned, and the right to hand such fortunes down by inheritance to future generations, even of one's own blood, is a right that this generation must consider in the light of the fundamental laws of truth and right.

Mr. Mills said upon this subject, "The right of no one should be permitted to acquire by inheritance more than the amount of a moderate independence!" And again, "In case of intestacy, the whole property should escheat to the state."

Upon this proposition, progressive thinkers would grant no right to an heir by bequest that they would not grant to the heir of an intestate, and this is right. The child's right, if he has any, is a right to receive, and not an inherent right in the property itself.

An authority of note says, "The right of a man to dispose of his property during his life cannot be separated from the property itself, but the right to dispose of it by will, or descent, taking effect after death is not so closely related with the right of property, and the right to tax it is a right that cannot be questioned. This right has been exercised by all the states of the Union except five, and the state constitutions specifically refer to the right." The authority to assess an inheritance tax is not questioned by the courts, nor is the authority to graduate the tax, charging a higher rate upon large estates than upon smaller ones.

But the people are asking some stubborn questions about their rights under the constitution and the laws, as they relate to property and its inheritance. Up to this time the courts have not been asked for the authority to assess upon estates more than a small tax, but the people want to know whether a man has a right, from

an economic standpoint of right relations among men, to hand down to his children all the vast wealth he may be able to accumulate under our system of commercial exploitation.

Upon this question the courts are speaking some very plain words. From Blackmore and Bancroft, the newest and most exhaustive treatise on the laws of inheritance and their taxation in recent years, we quote the following: "Firmly entrenched in a long and honorable history, with the endorsement of the leading economists of ancient and modern times, and with the approval of the present practise of the most enlightened governments, he would be brave indeed who should attempt to attack the theory or validity of any sane inheritance tax from the economic standpoint. From an economic standpoint no tax has more to commend it, and none is easier to defend, as has been well said. It does not touch private property during the life of the owner, and thus places no burden upon business activities. It is easily ascertained through the probate court. It invades no natural right. It violates no maxims of the law. It overlaps no constitutional barriers. It is neither revolutionary nor socialistic, but on the contrary is a measure of political wisdom and social justice and has been truly styled an institution of democracy. It cannot be shifted to other shoulders. Its collection is certain and economical. It falls upon wealth alone. It does not take what a taxpayers has, but what he is to get."

The beneficiaries of inheritance, the men and women who by reason of birth are about to possess the accumulations of a lifetime of another, cry out against any form of inheritance taxation by denying the right of the government to lay a special burden on capital. They say, "Such a tax will diminish the nation's wealth."

They complain "That it is a tax on widows and orphans and that it will discourage industry and drive capital out of the country." They say also "That it is confiscation, extortion, and a dangerous step toward communism," but the people are stubbornly insisting that modern society and law are fixing new rules and new relations between the men who have large fortunes and the men who produce them. They insist that the state is a silent partner in the business of every citizen, and that when the partnership is dissolved by death, the silent partner has a right to a share of the capital."

Thus it will be seen that there is no conflict at this time between the authorities on the right to levy an inheritance tax, and the right to fix a higher rate upon large than upon small estates. If these rights exist, and if it is true, as we think it is, that inheritances are levied, not on the theory of any right to tax the man who has passed away, but on the right of an individual to receive property by inheritance, then the fundamental question to be settled must be, "How much property has a man a right to inherit under the economic laws of right between man and man, and between the citizen and the government?"

Upon this question the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken in the following language: "Though the general consent of the most enlightened nations of the earth from the earliest historic period has recognized the right in the children to inherit the property of the parents, we know of no general principle to prevent the legislature from taking away, or limiting, the right of testamentary disposition, or imposing such conditions upon its exercise as it may deem conducive to the public good." Again it said, "Where logic and the policy of the state conflict with a fiction due to historic tradition,

the fiction must give way." Following this argument further, we quote from the Supreme Court of South Dakota, in which it says: "It must be conceded that if the legislature can fix a rate of taxation, it can increase such rates, and upon grounds of public policy, it might place a limit in the value, above which all transmissions would go to the state."

It will be seen that even the right to fix the amount that any individual might hand down to his legal heirs is within the authority of the state or government, and there is only one question left to be examined—the question of public policy.

In the examination of this question the first thing to be considered is the right of inheritance. Has a man an inherent right to all the property of which his parents may die seized?

At a time in our history this question would not have had the significance that attaches to it today. When estates represented only the legitimate earnings of men we would not think of questioning the right of a child to inherit the entire property of the parent, for an honest accumulation of wealth in the natural life of a man would never be great, but in these days when vast estates have been accumulated by special privilege laws, and are being handed down in many instances to people who never did a day's work to aid in their production or accumulation, it is time we began to study the question from the standpoint of the nation's safety and welfare.

We raise the question, "Has a man a right to bequeath to his heirs the great fortunes that have been amassed in this free country, through legally acquired special privilege and exploitation?"

Before answering this question we want to assert that

this generation is estimating the world by new rules. Fifty years ago greatness was measured by the rule of merit. Today every human value of the world has come to be measured by money. The commercial "Blue Book" everywhere fixes the measure of a man by that single standard, money. A man's value by that book is estimated good or bad by his ability to pay a debt. Honor has a small place in the commercial world when an estimate is asked for.

Nothing could be more unfortunate than that this dangerous tendency of the times should be encouraged to prevail. Wealth may be the result of some special opportunity. It may represent a systematic campaign of hard-bargaining. It may have been the result of some special privilege. It may have been handed down by inheritance, in which the beneficiary has given not a single personal effort in its creation. But no matter in what manner the wealth may have come to a man in these days of single standard of measures, a wise judgment of men can never be marked out by the single standard of money and riches.

The right of ownership of property has come to be one of the greatest problems that has engaged the wisdom of any age, and this nation must give itself to the study of that problem.

The right of ownership is not in every instance embodied in the possession of the property. The beauties of God's great creation in which we live is man's inheritance. It was God's gift to Adam and through him to all the children of men. If any man claims more of it than he could earn, or more than he can use if he lives a righteous life, his title is bad.

In the days of physical conquest the world readily discerned the need of protection of property by law,

and governments wrote that protection into the constitutions. In those good old days, little thought had been given to the means by which property was acquired. There was no need for it, but at this time the great accumulations of wealth raise new questions. In a thousand ways men have acquired fortunes that were not acquired by any code of morals that is recognized in the world today.

The problem of over-riches is one of the most serious problems of this nation. If you point to a question of disturbed conditions in the commercial world today, it would be safe to look behind the disturbance to commercial exploitation for the real cause.

The selfishness that has fastened itself upon society has been the underlying first cause of every war and of every revolution that has ever disgraced and despoiled the world. That spirit has built higher its monuments of wealth over the dead bodies of human toil, until the whole world is a human caldron of unrest and discontent.

Americans, we must halt in our scramble after the almighty dollar. The over-riches of this nation is a menace to the liberties of its people. Let us examine the great ledger balances and see for ourselves what the record will disclose. Only a few years ago, after a most stubborn fight in our congress, a law was passed making it the duty of those who were receiving incomes above a specified amount to pay a stipulated per cent of that income to the government. This is known as the income tax. The men who contended for that law insisted that the burdens of government were falling largely upon the shoulders of the middle and poorer classes, and that the very rich, while greatly profiting by the splendid opportunities the government offered for making, or getting,

money, were paying little if anything toward the support of the government. The rich men of the nation fought this measure to the highest courts of the country, but the law, after many exciting and uncertain delays, was finally declared in harmony with the constitution.

Under this law as it operated in 1920, twenty thousand residents of the United States reported incomes of over $50,000 each, and the world war added many hundred to the list. Ninety-five families in the same year confessed to an annual income of $750,000 to $1,000.000. Twenty-eight men reported incomes of $2,000,000. There are sixteen thousand men with incomes of $50,000 to $750,000. Two men reported incomes amounting to $3,000,000 and more than four million nine hundred thousand men and firms are at this time paying incomes under sworn statements amounting to $5,000 or more. More than ninety-two per cent of the wealth of the entire nation is owned at this time by less than two per cent of the people.

Only by comparison can we get the real meaning of this awful condition as the story is told by the nation's ledger.

Less than five million men and firms out of the one hundred and five million people within the jurisdiction of our country are able to qualify for an income tax which fixes the lowest income that is taxable at $2,000. While this is true, it must be recorded that more than fifty million of the people of our country are at this time paying tax, if at all, on less than the legal exemption from a judgment under execution, while the great middle classes, consisting of the other fifty million, are living along from year to year, many of whom are not able to lay by a cent for a rainy day.

From the insurance actuaries, as well as from a government report, we learn that only four men out of every hundred who die in the United States have a cent to leave to their families above the insurance they possess.

What a record is this in a country of the greatest opportunities that have been offered to the human family. In the olden days of conquest it was done by war, by force, and the conquested nation was deprived of its hard-earned wealth by force of arms, but in these days of intellectual conquest it is done by special privileges and without the knowledge of the intended victim.

The conquest of America has been quietly going on for more than fifty years, and that conquest was a deliberately planned scheme to gather interest from the people. Is the conquest complete at this time? Are we right when we say that these stupendous mountains of wealth are a menace to our liberties? Will the American people submit to this stealthy means of accumulating the results of the toil of the million freemen in this land of the free without a murmur? I want to assert that this record of wealth made by our own government is a most significant symptom of the beginning of national decay, for a nation, born to a heritage such as belongs to the men and women of America, still possess the spirit that actuated the fathers of this republic.

But we must stop a moment. We have not told you the most alarming part of this story. A large per cent of the property represented by this awful octopus of wealth is in the form of interest-bearing obligations of the people, such as tax-free mortgages and other income properties. The interest on these vast accumulations of wealth amounts at this time to more than five billion dollars, and only a small part of that vast sum of human

energy is paying a cent of tax in support of the government aside from the tax on the incomes it aids in making. This is not yet all. The national obligations at this time amount to more than twenty-four billion dollars and the obligations for future payment not otherwise considered will amount to more than one hundred billion dollars and to this vast sum we must add the annual premiums on life insurance policies amounting to more than forty-five billion dollars. And this is not yet all. In 1920 the government revenues amounted to a tax of forty-five dollars per capita and this would amount to more than two hundred dollars for every family of five. To this amount we must add not less than three hundred dollars for local taxes, bringing the grand total to five hundred and ninety-five dollars for the head of every family of five in the land.

As we write, the papers are reporting that there are more than five million unemployed in the country, and more than fifty million more living at the very lifeline of existence.

The President has called a council to consider the problem of unemployment. What is the problem of unemployment? Will this wise council consider more than to ascertain the fact of unemployment and advise industry to start the wheels moving? Will industry begin to build houses and make goods without a market for the goods nor people who can pay rent for the use of the houses? The President has asserted that the conference will not contemplate charity, or in other words, aid from the Federal government. I want to assert that the problem of unemployment will not be solved in this country until industrial peace shall have been realized, and industrial peace will never be realized until the handicap of the poverty that industrial exploitation and

interest-gathering make possible shall be so regulated as to establish some system of righteousness in the world that will restore to the people the millions of wealth that at this time are sapping the very life of the nation through interest. The disease of which we are complaining at this time is not the disease of over-production, but the disease of under-consumption, and the remedy will be found, if at all, in a complete restoration of the government to the people and the establishment of that government upon sound principles of economic righteousness, instead of the selfishness that has built up uncurbed greed.

Over-riches is the direct cause of the pitiful poverty and unemployment in this nation today. Debt is the nightmare of any man, and it is the nightmare of any nation. The conquest of this nation by its interest gatherers is complete. What does it mean? It simply means that the nation's conquesters are masters, and the laborers of the nation are industrial slaves. And then what? Shall this great nation ignore the lessons of history, and begin a series of compromises as they did in the settlement of the slavery question? Have we not learned that history teaches by example, and that a nation that will not take heed to the lessons of history must pay the penalty? The world is crying out for a Garrison and a Wendell Phillips or a Harriet Beecher Stowe, because they know that they were brave enough to strike at the root of an evil. Before the civil war they cried out "*Slavery is a crime against God. Abolish it.*" That cry was an appeal to right a fundamental wrong. It was made by fearless men and women who knew the dangers of compromise upon a principle of right. Such men and women are the burning need of the world today. If they were here they would raise their patriotic

voices in the new cry: "*Over-riches* is a menace to the liberties of a free people. No man in America can own and hold wealth that he did not earn and wealth that he cannot use while five million are without the right to labor for the bread of life. Restore these great fortunes to the people who earned them. The life of this nation is trembling between the only remedy for the wrong by legal restitution or by disgraceful ruin."

The children of Israel applied this remedy while they journeyed through the wilderness on their way to the land of Promise, and we must apply it as we journey toward the ideals of our forefathers.

A National Fixed Inheritance

The right of inheritance has been one of the most mooted questions of the laws of descent. Even at this time the rights of direct heirs as well as indirect heirs are respected by the law. Bequest has ever been respected by the law and the courts, even to the disregard of those who might have claimed had the decedent died intestate, but in these latter years the right of inheritance and the right of bequest have been questioned by the greatest students of economics.

So new is the question of the right to inherit that timid people are asking for more light upon the entire subject. The people want to know whether restitution as it would be asked under a "fixed inheritance tax" such as we propose would be lawful, and then when we answer that it is upheld by the highest court of the nation, they ask, "Is it right?" Answering this question, we must ask by what right can any man inherit the property of another when he never rendered a day of service that aided in its production? By no law of

right can any man justly claim property that he had no part in bringing into existence.

A "fixed inheritance law" would ignore all claims but the claims of direct heirs, and to these heirs it would give only an amount that would be fixed by law, and that amount would apply to every direct heir and to no others.

The widow of a deceased person would be given an amount sufficient to keep her in comfort and luxury during her natural life, measured by our American standards of living, and to the children we would give an amount sufficient to give them a good start in life. This amount as well as the amount of a widow's inheritance would be fixed by law and the balance of every estate would be given to the government and placed in the general funds of the nation.

Would any man complain of this disposition of his estate when the amount given to his widow would be sufficient to keep her in comfort and luxury the balance of her days, and would any red-blooded young American complain when he must start the race of life with a fair competence, while thousands of his fellows must begin life without a penny? The young man who would complain of such a disposition of his father's estate, or of the fact that he must begin life with only this advantage over the thousands of our American youth, who must run the race of life in the same world with him, is not worthy the title "American."

After you have asked the question, "Is it right?" then tell us, "What has the *hope* of an inheritance done for the human family?" I know your answer. You would say that the *hope* of an inheritance has stood in the way of the moral and intellectual progress of every generation, and *inherited* property has been the cause of

more legal contention, broken more ties of affection, and ruined more lives than any single thing in the world.

It has furnished the Harry Thaws of every generation. It has filled our courts with contentions and our penitentiaries with its misguided victims.

If these answers are right, then your question, "Is it right?" is answered.

And now you are asking, "What will such a law do for the world?" I will tell you. In one generation it will return to the treasury of the nation many times more money than would pay our national debt. It would legalize the status of every man, woman and child as a direct heir to all the accumulations of great wealth without bringing a single individual to want. It would pave the way to the ownership of a home for every one of the millions of laborers that under present laws can have no hope that they can ever own a home. It will christianize property. It will let our boys and girls of coming generations know that the promise of Life, Liberty and Happiness for which our forefathers fought was meant for them and for their children.

Churches of America! This is christianity at work. It is the only solution to the problem of over-riches, and it will stand the test of the closest scrutiny of the courts and that court of last resort, the people, as to its righteousness.

The day of accounting is here. That accounting must consider the welfare of the people. It must answer for the sins of the past. Restitution has followed the judgments of the courts for centuries, and that principle of law is imbedded in the very first principles of the ownership of property.

Out in the great cattle countries of the west, if a man gets possession of a steer that carries another man's

brand, when the proof is complete, the laws of that so-called lawless country render judgment of punishment and restitution of the steer. Your brand in that country is *prima facie* evidence of ownership. Whose brand appears upon the wealth of the hoarded millions of America's today? Have they placed their brand upon the laboring man's steer? Was the wealth they claim not created by the labor of this nation? If the brand of labor is on the steer that makes up the hoarded millions of the over-riches of this nation, a judgment of restitution will be rendered by the highest court that ever sat in judgment upon the rights of a great people in any country on earth.

Will anyone say that under righteous laws of ownership the people who today claim ownership of the vast fortunes would have a right to insist upon the claim? Will anyone deny that the labor of this nation produced them? Will anyone insist that the commonly accepted laws of inheritance apply in any moral sense to these aggregations of wealth or that they are a good thing for the people of a free country, or that it is safe or right to permit them to be handed down to future generations to debauch them and oppress the people who earned them?

If a man can disinherit his own son or daughter under our laws and leave his entire property to another, even though they may have helped to earn the property, why cannot this great christian nation disinherit the man who never earned a cent of the wealth he is about to hand down and distribute it among the people who did earn it?

Under our *Fixed Inheritance tax law* the settlement of an estate would be entirely in the hands of the government, and its probate courts, who would simply find

the amount of the estate, and the legal heirs, and then, after giving to every legal heir his share as fixed by law, the balance would go into the national treasury to be used as the government provided. In other words, the partnership between the decedent and the government would be settled and the property divided as provided by law.

Under this law the heirs would be protected. Disputes and contests would be a thing of the past. Minor children would no longer be at the mercy of unwise or dishonest guardians, but the government would stand sponsor not only for the safekeeping of the minor's share of the estate, but of its safe investment.

A Fixed Inheritance law will cure the world of that canker of greed that today is eating out the very life of the people. It would turn the mind of men to constructive righteousness, instead of the miserly hoarding of wealth. It would stop the future development of that sixth sense, that sense that has been in rapid development in the human family since the scramble for the almighty dollar has so enslaved the miserly mind of man that he will forget everything else and go on hoarding wealth until the tottering footsteps of old age fail him at the very edge of an open grave. It would insure a more brotherly relation between men, and give to the world a new vision of life. It would encourage thrift, because not a single young man would fold his hands and wonder when his good old father would die and the estate be divided.

Such a law would not in the least interfere with the property of men of moderate means, but it would restore to the people of the next generation all that surplus of wealth that today represents the fortunes that are paying a meager income tax such as we related in the beginning of this chapter.

A Fixed Inheritance tax simply asks for the restitution of the divine law of right, and that restitution is not asked during the life of the individual.

We have been proud of the boast of our equality before the law, but is there any equality in laws that permit such a handicap in the race of life as at this time allows one boy to start life with a fortune and compels a thousand boys just as good, just as industrious, just as intelligent, to start life without a penny?

Men and women of America! We repeat for emphasis that the questions you are to settle in this contention are the questions between restitution and ruin. Restitution means nothing less than industrial freedom, and future generations will point to it as the emancipation proclamation that shall establish the freedom of labor from the industrial slavery that today holds it in bondage.

Will you help us write this verdict into the great court judgments of this nation and permit the execution of that judgment to return to the people the teeming millions of wealth that today disgrace our christian civilization?

Fellow Americans! You have many questions to settle before you can realize the Liberty and Freedom and Happiness which was the hope of our forefathers and the world. Too long you have sought that promised happiness in commercial exploitation. Liberty and Freedom can never be realized under the awful handicap of wealth that today holds this nation in its grip. The yoke of slavery was never more galling to the negroes of the Southland than this yoke of industrial slavery is to American freemen.

Help us to remove this handicap of poverty, and let our boys and girls of coming generations know that the

promise of Life, Liberty and Happiness for which our forefathers fought was meant for them and for their children.

If you will help us write this new doctrine of a Christian Democracy into law, and to so christianize the wealth of this nation as to bring a new era of righteousness into the world, you and your children will be the beneficiaries of that benediction that is sure to be shed upon the world.

Chapter XII

TO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF AMERICA

America has more than a hundred million of the most progressive, energetic and enlightened people under the sun. The world's population multiplies this several times. Of this vast army more than fifty millions are communicants in the christian churches of the land. The vision of these churches for the uplift of the world has been so broad that it has reached into every country, and it is at this time committed to the christianizing of more than a hundred million human souls.

Through nearly two hundred christian denominations it has tried to impress its messages upon the human understanding of men.

Humanity has ever been the primary interest of religion and to the church, as it represents the Christ in the world, belongs the work of speaking for humanity. Is the church ready to assume the great responsibility that such an undertaking brings? It ought to be ready for this great task, but it must understand and take account that we are living in an age of a new social consciousness. The literature of every country throbs with it. It is reflected in the press, and it has found its way into the colleges and the universities. Political parties are taking notice, and legislators are grappling with it.

For centuries the churches have been talking and preaching about a personal religion, and even at this time there are those who will insist that the church must stand aloof from all questions but the "fruits of the spirit," which they say is the only concern of the church.

But there is a social revolution on, and it cannot be stopped. That social revolution has a vision for the future, not of the churches alone, but of the world. It is building up a new hope. It is seeking new definitions that apply to religion as well as to business, and the christian churches must give it support and assist in its guidance.

The problems that are being discussed are not the problems of a personal religion, and while they are not antagonistic to a personal religion, they are insisting that the church must concern itself with the great unsolved problems of the world as they relate to the lives of the people who make up the great masses of the human family. These are not the problems of the poor alone. They are not the problems of the rich, but they are the problems that must be settled before a real christianity can hope to gain a foothold even in this home of religious liberty.

The world must learn that man is more than property. When Abraham Lincoln wrote the emancipation proclamation he wrote into the institutions of this country that man is no longer property, but from the day the armistice was signed at Appomattox, property and money, and the power they brought to those in possession of them, got a strangle-hold upon the people of this nation and the purpose of that strangle-hold was to fasten upon labor industrial slavery instead of chattel slavery.

Since the civil war the people of this christian nation, tired of war, have given themselves to the development of our great undeveloped resources and to the acquisition of wealth. The prizes of this undeveloped country in a time of the greatest inventive skill in the manufacture of improved labor-saving machinery, invited the

brightest minds of the age to the industrial conquest of the country. Literature, art, oratory, law, medicine, all these offered less alluring opportunities than business in the conquest for the wealth that was hidden in the mountains and in the richest valleys and prairies in the world.

Will anyone wonder that the allurements of such occupations, under such passions as gripped the industrial world, should make men forget God? Need we be surprised that men who had forgotten God would set up and worship a god of gold?

They were spanning a continent with steel. They were making homes out on the great western plains. They were filling our treasury with gold and other precious metals of our mountains. All these activities forced into their lives the problems of industrial expansion. Industrial expansion suggested special privileges. Wild with the fervor of industrial expansion, they forgot God, and they forgot that their rights and their liberties were being parceled out, and that some day they would awaken and remember those prophetic words of our lamented Lincoln when he said to the people, "Beware of that power that is today threatening to place money above labor in the structure of the government," and then he said that the time would come when "All of liberty would be lost."

It is true that the "March of Empire" toward the great western plains laid the foundation of a great commonwealth, but it is also true that the grants of our government of the lands of the people to promote the building of railroads, despoiled them of their lands, built the roads, put the rolling stock on them and left the promoters the entire property that should have been, and was by right, the property of the people.

Not satisfied with the millions thus acquired without effort, they exploited the pioneers out on the bleak prairies of the west for all the traffic would bear, and perpetuated their special privileges by corrupting legislatures. These promoters were nothing less than millionaire monopolies by the gift of the government. Commercialized greed in the saddle. Money their god. Industrial power their ideal. Can any man wonder that, after fifty years, the people are facing an industrial revolution, and that they are asking some stubborn questions about business and about religion?

The free homes of fifty years ago are the mortgaged and the tenant homes of today. Those homes were built out of the greatest sacrifices that were ever made by the pioneers of any land. The history of those sacrifices will never be written. Every landscape is bedecked with the evidences of blighted hopes and aspirations. This was a conquest for homes. It was the building of a great empire. It went ahead of the churches and the schools. It left the comforts of an older civilization behind, and it never realized the blessings of the new.

The churches followed. They were filled with the spirit of the builders of the great west. Each denomination vied with every other denomination in the conquest of the spiritual world, and that conquest has been going on in the entire country for more than a hundred years. This was a peaceful conquest, but it served the purpose of engendering strife and bitter contentions. The histories of the olden times tell us that the wars of those times were religious wars, and that among the monarchies of the old world every hillside was bedecked with the graves of religious martyrs.

Must the world be christianized by conquest? Must the people be awakened through a baptism of blood?

Does sorrow and suffering bring us closer to the Master? Is it true that the road to the cross must lead us through a vale of tears? Does fear lead a man closer to God than love? Listen! When religion typified the Christ life, when it stood for the invisible God, it might have had a vision for those who understood its meaning, but in the great struggle of the world today, the word, and the two hundred creeds of the two hundred denominations that represent those creeds, must stand aside while we learn anew the doctrines of the Model Man of Galilee. His life and His teachings are the last arguments in the religious ethics of the world, and instead of "religious emotions" we must bow at the feet of the Master and accept His simple teachings as the rule of life.

What matters it to the world if, while they are shouting their hallelujahs of an emotional religion, their homes are being taken from them by an organized scheme of exploitation that renders the burdens of life intolerable, and at the same time renders impossible the raising and education of a family?

Christ gave to the people a real program of social and community service. He was concerned about their bodies and their minds and their social conditions. He fed the hungry, He clothed the naked, He ministered to the sick, He taught the people in His parable of the last judgment that what is done for man is done as a service to God.

John Ruskin, almost forgotten, said, "There is a true church wherever one man meets another helpfully. That is the only holy mother church which ever was or ever will be." This is the doctrine of human need satisfied in human service.

Social service is as old as society. It began when man needed the help of his neighbors. It draws men to-

gether. Christian life is christian service, not service for self, but service to others.

It won't do to talk in these times about "religious emotions." The world has been fed on religious emotions for a thousand years. We have too long overlooked the fact that religion is primarily a life, and that instead of trying to save our own souls out of the wreck of a lost world, we should devote ourselves to saving the world. We have failed to make men understand that if they are fit to live, they will be ready to die.

These are burning words. They are not intended to lightly speak of the emotional side of the religious life, but to impress the church of today that in this awful industrial crisis we must give our strength and our abilities first to the industrial reconstruction of the world. For more than fifty years we have been building up a commercial despotism such as no country ever saw. Has the church not been swallowed up in the great whirlpool of this commercial despotism and lost its vision of a redeemed world? And has it not lost sight of the blight that special privilege and commercial exploitation bring?

The greatest revolution that has ever engrossed the minds of men is in progress at this very moment, and the church must know that industrial, economic and social reconstruction must go hand in hand in this great revolution. The rights of men must be weighed in the balance with the rights of property and money, and these things must be taught in the schools. These rights must be proclaimed from the pulpit, and the church must quit "labeling men and women for transportation to a realm unknown," and enlist the great army of God's noblemen in this conflict for industrial and social reconstruction.

Have the churches not yet come to understand that the economic and industrial conditions under which we live renders it impossible for a man to live a Christian life, and raise and educate his family, and succeed in business? This statement falls short of the truth. A young man who marries today cannot in a whole lifetime earn a living for even a small family, and lay by enough money ever to own a home of his own.

I well know there are exceptions to this statement, but the exceptions are very rare, for the industrial struggle has already closed the doors of opportunity for those who would enter, and that industrial struggle is an overpowering impediment to the christianizing of the world.

What must be done to remove these impediments? The church must be aroused. It must take a mighty interest in this greatest crisis that has ever come to the world. It must help to breathe into the hearts and minds of the people a real spirit of fundamental truth. The laymen and the laywomen must be enlisted in the work. They must know that their homes are in jeopardy, if they have any, and if they have not, then it is the possibility ever to own a home that is about to be lost. These laymen and laywomen may lack something in rhetoric, but they will make up in their sympathies and experience what they may lack in eloquence.

Have we not come to know that the world is charged and surcharged with good will? Do the people not believe in a square deal? Can we not organize and capitalize that good will? And then, can we not apply the teachings of the Master to the solution of the complex social and economic problems of the life of today? If we fail to do this, or if we close our eyes and refuse to do it, it means that the churches have no message for

the age. We must proclaim these new doctrines of "rights" and "duties" until the golden rule of life shall be applied by employer and employee, to landlord, to tenant, to seller, to buyer, to mistress, to servant, to promoter, to investor, to rich, to poor, and under all we must remove the laws that make the conditions under which we live possible.

In this struggle we will need great teachers. We will need men and women to make sacrifices. We will need men and women to do heroic acts. We will need red-blooded, liberty-loving and God-fearing men and women who are willing to give their *very lives* to the great cause for which we stand. Will we find these men and women? We shall see.

The world war crystallized a new vision into a working force in the organization of the interchurch world movement. This organization has brought to the churches and the world a new vision of the problems of mankind. It has sensed the spirit and the power of organization, and through that organization it is putting into effect the greatest campaign of investigation that was ever undertaken. It has come to recognize the fundamental fact that the first need of the world is a thorough diagnosis of the diseases of the world before attempting to apply remedies. With this great army of righteous men and women, the diagnosis of the problems of the world will be disclosed and then a real reconstruction can be effected.

Since writing this chapter the temporary collapse of the Inter-Church-world movement has been announced. Every christian in America will deplore the inconvenience it has suffered. The whole christian world rejoiced in the vision and the christian spirit that prompted and set in motion that organization. It looked backward with sorrow to the wasted energies of disorganization, and forward to the unification of the churches of the nation in the great work of christianizing of the world.

The organization of the christian forces of America has not failed. It is only waiting for new recruits, and for new alignments. In its first drive for a diagnosis of the conditions of labor, it was confronted by the greatest power in America today, saying: "Thus far and no farther". It will not appeal for new recruits in vain. God will never permit a movement conceived in such a spirit of uplift for humanity to fail.—The Author.

Immediately these investigations and the remedies must be directed to the solution of the problems of our own country, for world reconstruction and regeneration must begin in America. We must set our own house in order, and then we can look across the waters into other lands.

For centuries the missionaries of every denomination have carried their message of the Christ into unfriendly countries, and the difficulties that have retarded the progress of these missionaries, and the sacrifices they have made, have never been brought to the American mind in their full meaning. Christian people everywhere believed that the world war had opened up the unfriendly countries, wiped out the prejudices of the past and paved the way for the spread of the gospel without the hindrances that have so long retarded Christian efforts in the past. The challenge of the dark places of the old world was the greatest challenge that has ever come to the churches of the world, but the churches well knew that such a work was possible only through Christian co-operation. That challenge and the vision of the churches was the interpretation of the gospel into every language and the carrying of that gospel into every country.

What a vision! But do the churches not know that christianizing an unfriendly country without first cultivating friendly political relations is worse than futile? The ground must be prepared. The seed must be planted. Then, with the labor of the husbandman, and the sun-

shine and the shower, the harvest of the autumn will be assured.

If this doctrine is good as it applies to christianizing the world, it is good as it applies to christianizing America. The christianizing of America is the challenge of the church at this time, and the great call to the churches of this nation is a thorough diagnosis of the underlying causes of the discontent and unrest that is at this time retarding the progress of christian efforts.

The very fact of the organization of the interchurch world movement recognizes the wastes of disunion. In the past the energies of the churches have been frittered away by competition, jealousies, controversies and friction caused by disunion. The worst enemies of the churches in the past have been within their own households. The early fathers of the church may have made mistakes, but twentieth century christianity must have a broader vision. They recognize that there was never a church without its alloy. Where one is strong, another is weak. Because churchmen have been over-tenacious of creed, and full of contempt for those who differed from them, and because of their many varieties of religion, and theories, and phases of thought, creeds, liberty of worship, all these have contributed to whatever failure may be truthfully ascribed to the church as it has lost its leadership in the progressive ideals of life. It has been well said that a divided christianity must mean in its last analysis an unbelieving world, for the forces of evil are ever consolidated in an unholy alliance against everything that is good in the world.

A thousand voices from within and without are calling upon the christian churches to unite, and the response they shall make to this call will be the supreme test of christianity.

Religion is not a profession. It is not a theory. It is not an experience. It is a life, and a social comradeship.

If this is true, and we believe progressive christian thinkers everywhere will give their hearty approval of it, then the building of a christian democracy in this country to take the place of the unchristian government that is represented by our "government by party and the spoils system," under which we have so long been misgoverned and misruled, must be the first work of the christian churches.

A Christian Democracy! The prophecy that "a nation shall be born in a day" fulfilled. Whether such a democracy shall be born in a day, or whether it shall consume a decade, little concerns the liberty-loving christian people of this republic, but the fact that the christian churches of this nation have, as one man, gotten a vision of that idealism which alone can redeem this nation from sordid greed, and furnish the world with a new altruistic impulse, this makes all the difference in the world. Cannot the world look to the churches to aid in a reformation that is so momentous, and that promises so much for human uplift, a reformation that with one *fell stroke* will plant righteousness where unrighteousness thrived; that will destroy political graft, and restore this great government to the people; that will assure a happy home for every industrious laborer within our country; that will within one generation restore to the people the ill-gotten gains of half a century and bring happiness where today there is nothing but discontent and bitter industrial slavery; that will forever destroy the spirit of strife that has kept the country in a war of strikes and lockouts, cannot the world look to the churches to aid in such a momentous enterprise as this?

Someone is asking how this can be done? The readiness to do it is the best answer to this question.

The christian churches of America have a membership of forty-three million souls. They have two hundred three thousand four hundred and thirty-eight church edifices where every Sabbath these communicants congregate for worship. If the church people shall undertake the task of spiritualizing the ideals of a christian democracy, and setting the house of this nation in order, they would have an army of forty-three million of the brightest and the best of the manhood and womanhood of America already enlisted in the great cause for which we plead. Every church would open its doors for community meetings, and those community meetings would have for their immediate purpose the building of a real christian democracy. Such a democracy would be built upon the eternal foundations of truth, against which the wastes of time could not prevail. Such an organization and such a purpose would put new blood into the official life of this nation, and it would organize and set in motion the greatest problem solving campaign that was ever organized on earth. It would displace misrepresentation by planting eternal truth. It would destroy the pie-counter in the political life of this nation, and in its stead it would build among the people a spirit of trust that would not be subject to the uncertainty of political graft and to the cries of "special privilege" seekers.

Churches of America! This is the greatest challenge to your spirit of christianity that has been made since the civil war. It has a vision for every citizen under the jurisdiction of this government. It is the beginning of a program that must never be abandoned until this government is made a christian government in fact as

well as in name, and when that purpose is accomplished the world will be able to see how easy it is to apply the doctrines of the Christ to the laws that make for the very life of the nation.

A Christian Democracy! The doctrines of every church denomination in the land applied to the single purpose of realizing and spiritualizing the doctrines of the Savior of men, in law.

Chapter XIII

TO THE NEWLY ENFRANCHISED WOMEN OF AMERICA

For a hundred years you have pleaded the cause of enfranchisement of the women of America in the greatest court of public thought and public opinion on earth.

Many noble women have devoted their very lives that this christian nation might be made to realize that the right of full partnership between man and woman in the affairs of the nation is fundamental.

You have pleaded for this partnership because it embodied one of the fundamental principles for which our forefathers fought in the revolutionary struggle.

You have told the people from every forum in America that if "taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776, it has been tyranny ever since against the women of America."

You have urged your cause because you knew that in the settlement of the great moral and political questions so urgently demanding solution in the nation the councils of the mothers of America were needed.

You have blushed when you have been obliged to admit that the politicians of both dominant political parties every four years turned a deaf ear to your pleas, and you well know that the refusal to grant suffrage to the women of the nation was a tacit admission that they feared the influence of the women at the ballot box.

Nobody knows better than the mothers of America that it took a great war, with its arguments of waste, to submit the question of constitutional prohibition to the people, and it took the supreme need of the women to go

to the front and bind up the wounds of our boys in the great war to soften their hearts to the submission of the amendment providing for suffrage. The achievement of these great victories was the greatest achievement for moral and civic righteousness that has come to this nation since the birth of the republic. These amendments to our constitution are already indelibly written into the hearts of the people, and the day of their complete ratification by the states will be celebrated by future generations as the beginning of a new era of righteousness in our country.

The legalized saloon debauched the moral and political life of this nation for more than a century, and the refusal of the political parties to place in the hands of the women of this nation that greatest of all weapons, the ballot, with which they might crush that monster of wrong was a cowardly political crime that must be charged to both political parties alike.

If any class of the citizens of America has had opportunity to understand the weakness of our system of law making through political parties, or government by party, the women of America, constituting at this time more than half of the voting strength of the entire nation, have certainly had the fullest opportunity, as they have seen the cowardly attitude they have shown toward these two great reforms. There was never a time during the agitation of these great reforms when, if the question could have been considered by the people without the prejudices and misrepresentation that go with every question that must seek adjustment through political action, it would not have been settled by the wisdom of the people in one campaign. Had either question been presented directly to the people through such a referendum as we propose, prohibition and suffrage would both have been realized fifty years ago.

But no good can come at this time by repining over the wrongs of the past. The women are already clothed with full citizenship, and the people are waiting anxiously to know just what influence their enfranchisement will have on the affairs of the nation.

Nobody knows better than the mothers of this land that public opinion must precede legislation, and nobody knows better than they that the road to a healthy public sentiment is through the homes and the schools and the churches. The planting of the seeds of truth is the fundamental need of this republic at this time, and the destruction of the power of political misrepresentation that has so long stood in the way of reform is the burning problem of the age.

It is futile to cry out against false education, and corrupt conditions, and unjust laws, and inertia among the people, unless we can remove the machinery that allows these things to exist and plant something in its stead that will correct the evil. This is to be one of the first duties of the newly enfranchised women of America.

Enfranchisement has changed woman's outlook upon life. It has changed her property status. It has changed her domestic relations and her social conditions and these changes must make for the integrity of the home, as well as for the stability of the nation. Suffrage has harnessed the man and wife side by side, instead of working them tandem, with the husband as the leader and the wife as the wheeler in the team.

But the burning question of today is, "What will the women do with their newly achieved responsibilities as citizens?" Will they begin the organization of republican and democratic clubs and enter the many fields of political muck-raking campaigns for offices? If they shall permit themselves to be drawn into this caldron of

political corruption, the nation will go down as Rome did in the early history of the world.

Lest someone should take too much to heart the questions I propounded, I hasten to say that the question would never give concern to one who has ever understood the mother heart of American women. A representative mother of the nation only a short time ago said: "God's laws, in their very nature, will always lead a great majority of the women directly to the home, to the intimacy and love of family life, to motherhood, and its duties in the raising of children, and enfranchisement will implant in them a higher consciousness of their duties and their obligations than they have ever known before."

Who knows better than the American women that the foundation of this republic is the American home? Have they not been fighting for the destruction of the saloons for more than a hundred years, because they knew that the business of the saloon was the destruction of the homes?

The American Home

If the American home is to be the foundation of this republic, then we must look well to the foundation of the American homes.

The beginning of the home is the marriage relation. Before the marriage relation is the period of mating, and the period of mating is the real beginning of the home.

In the ceremonies of many of the churches solemnizing the marriage relation, they conclude with the words, "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

There are those today who tell us that marriage is a civil contract and nothing more. It is true that the law makes marriage a civil contract, but does this mean that

it is nothing more than a civil contract? Is it not a fact that the law simply holds the marriage relation to be a civil contract for the protection of society from those who would impose upon it by making marriage a mockery?

The doctrines of "Free Love" and the theories of "Affinity" have threatened and destroyed many homes. They are the doctrines of the "Evil One" and they plant nothing but ruin in the homes of the innocent for selfish purposes.

Whether we believe that marriage is a civil contract and nothing more, or that the love of a man and woman that culminates in the marriage relation is more than a civil contract and that it is recorded in High Heaven, we must recognize that any disturbance of that relation at any stage of the married life is a direct menace to the sanctity and security of the American home.

It is not our purpose in this to discuss the question of who should marry, but we cannot refrain from making the statement that the mating time among our young people has too often been attended with little consideration for the problems of the future.

The marriage vows are not simply for the passing day; they are for life. Marriage is not simply a contract in law, but its sacred authority began in the Garden of Eden, and he who lightly trifles with the sacred rights of a man and his lawfully wedded wife is striking a deadly blow at the very foundations of the republic.

We are considering one of the greatest problems of the age. Its seriousness concerns every parent as well as every citizen. We are teaching our boys and girls the importance of improving the breeds of the horses and cattle and hogs on the farms, but we are failing to

apply the same common sense in the solution of the problems of match-making among our children. If the boys and girls of this generation have any right to complain against their parents for neglect to impress those fundamental truths that so vitally relate to the future happiness of the fathers and mothers of the next generation, that right of complaint will relate first of all to their failure to give them a thorough knowledge of the entire philosophy of sex as it relates to marriage, and of marriage as it relates to the making of a home, and that knowledge should come to the child before it is too late.

The world is full of mistakes in marriage that should have been avoided. Control is not possible, but there are some mistakes that must be avoided if the safety of the American home is to be kept pure and sacred.

The words I am now about to speak are spoken for the mothers and fathers who have boys and girls that some time in the future are to become prospective brides and bridegrooms. An American home cannot stand the severe tests of the future for peace and security unless it is founded upon, and has its beginnings in, a single standard of moral purity. Fathers and mothers, if you permit your pure girl to stand at the marriage altar with a man who cannot qualify for the same purity as the girl he is to marry, you are doing that daughter a wrong that you can never make right, and you are permitting a home to be started under a handicap that is almost certain to bring disaster at some time during the life of the new home builders.

There has been much talk about eugenic laws for the protection of society as it relates to marriage, but while such laws are necessary in this evil-minded generation, in the beginnings of a home in which the single stand-

ard of purity is assured as I have suggested, with a man fit to be the king and a woman fit to be the queen of that beautiful home life, renders that home in reality an enduring foundation of our American life.

Such a home invites equality, acquiescence, sacrifice, indulgence and wise-thoughted, deep-hearted co-operation with a steadfast purpose of doing duty at whatever cost.

The making of such a home as this, is to be a capitalist, as well as an altruist. Back of such a home as this is the guaranty of the government. At such a fireside is sure to sit the motherhood of the nation, and those who might lay foul hands upon that home will now have to reckon with the mothers of this land.

Were I to emphasize the first great problem that confronts the newly enfranchised women of America, I would say with a double emphasis that the very first duty of the women of America is to look well to the laying in enduring truth of the foundations of American life by laying well the foundations of purity in the American home.

The beginning of a real christian American home must first of all contemplate a right vision of what a home shall mean to the home-builders and to the community and the state and the nation.

What was God's plan of life? What was His purpose of the sex relation? He said, "It is not good for man to live alone. I will make him an help-meet for him." When Eve had been created, God blessed them and said, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it."

As I look around me and see the discontent in the world, as I read the stories of broken marital vows, and the inconstancy of one or the other in the sacred rela-

tion of husband and wife, I can only wonder where lies the fault. I have always thought that if a man had needed more than one woman, God would have provided him with another, or as many as he needed, and if this is true there can be no natural cause or excuse for inconstancy.

The court records of this nation disclose an appalling condition when we read the petitions setting up the items that form the basis of a petition for divorce. Inconstancy, infidelity, lost affection, lack of affinity, failure of support, and many others too frivolous for consideration.

Let no man or woman consider the question of divorce in a spirit of levity. Every cause that may be recited as a cause of legal separation is simply another demand for self-examination of our solution of the problems relating to the making and the protection of the homes of this nation. Many of the homes that end in divorce should never have been contemplated in the beginning. An intelligent word of wisdom might have avoided a mistake. Too little attention has been paid to the misguided judgment of innocent children. Too many times there is no vision, and no understanding of the sacred obligations of the relation of husband and wife, and too many times other causes contribute to the breaking up of otherwise happy homes.

Must I say that one of the first causes of the beginnings of discontent and final divorce lies in the fact that maternity is not respected in the raising of a family. Did God mistake His injunction to our first parents when He said, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it?" Look around you and answer me. Is God's injunction to our first parents being obeyed? Is the world being peopled by multiplication

or by addition? Is the family of this generation what God intended it should be? Does the marriage relation bring a vision of such a home as we must have to be the bulwark of American life? Let me assert that if the young men and women who are being united today in the holy bonds of matrimony would avoid the sorrow and the disgrace of a lost affection and of inconstancy in the chosen partner in that sacred obligation of the marital relation they will find one of the remedies in "the baby in the home."

If I were painting a picture of the beginning of an ideal home that is to be the bulwark of American life, I would paint that home to show a pure minded man to be the king and a spotless woman to be the queen of that home, and then I would paint that loving father and mother looking down into the cradle where their first-born was cooing its happy approval of the love that shone from the eyes of those parents as they beheld in a vision of the future the developed son or daughter just ready to start out to do battle in this unfriendly world.

Happy is the child who is born into a home where such a welcome awaits it as this, and happy are the parents who can watch the physical growth and the mental development of a child of their own flesh and blood that is born in the environments of a pure, well-considered love.

Do I need to say that no man is a real man after God's own plan of life who has not heard the infant cry of distress, and felt the soft hands of his own child, and no woman is a real woman until her mother heart has known the love of a tender offspring? God's law of life has provided the means and the limitations of the marital relation, and the broken law of those "means and limitations" is certain to bring to whoever breaks

that law the punishment that is as certain as any law of cause and effect in the world.

If the marriage vow shall bring no promise of the fulfillment of that command with which God blessed the marriage relation when he created Mother Eve to be a helpmeet to Father Adam, barring natural impediments, then the marriage relation is nothing less than legalized prostitution, and the home that was the promise of that sacred union is made a harem instead of a home.

This is plain speaking, but the time has come for plain speaking. Homes that fail to measure up to the standard we have set are not homes, but breeding places for divorce.

Is there anything in all the world more beautiful than an ideal home? Is there a nobler purpose in life than the rearing of a happy family?

Such a home is a beautiful world in which to live. To be at the head of such a home is a higher mission than the call to fill the greatest pulpit in America or the place of a star actress upon the stage.

Such homes as this beginning is sure to make are the kind of homes that are to be the enduring foundation of this republic, and the first work of the women of America is to bring such conditions in economics, in education, and in environment as to make such homes not only possible, but common in this country.

But the women of America must take America as it is. We have made mistakes. We are drifting away from the ideals of the fathers, but whatever mistakes we have made in the past, they cannot be justly charged to the women.

It has been said that enfranchisement would place a special emphasis upon the moral and social sides of legal enactments. This may be true, but I want to insist that

even the moral and social questions that must be solved in this country are questions that do not peculiarly belong to the women. There is no question that does not place the same obligation upon the man as upon the woman, and if either shifts the burden and the responsibility to the shoulders of the other, such a shifting of burdens is culpable.

Divorce

Just at this time this nation is facing, and must give serious consideration to, a problem that has become a national problem in its scope, as well as in its menace to the very life of the republic. It is the problem of marriage and divorce.

Fifty years ago divorce was practically unknown. Today it is one of the perplexing questions of our social and political life. It is shaking the very foundations of the homes of the nation. It has even come into the nation as an argument for new thoughts and new theories that menace the very foundation of our society.

Separate marriage laws in each of the states in the Union permitting, as they do, a separation by divorce in one state and then a speedy marriage in another, has become such an alarming menace to the security of the family life that the people are aroused for the safety of the future. The theory that marriage is nothing more than a civil contract, and the fact that marriage laws in the several states have reflected that theory through the laxity of their provisions, has so aroused the country as to force the legislature of every state into the passage of laws requiring a recorded marriage license, and in fifteen states they have passed eugenic laws.

In South Carolina divorces are still unknown. In New York a divorce may be granted only on proof of infidelity, while in the middle states a divorce may be

granted on any one of ten grounds, among which are excuses that are most flimsy, and divorce has become in these states so common as to create little more than a passing comment.

Every year from 70,000 to 80,000 children are robbed of one or both parents by divorce, and at the same time they are robbed of property that otherwise might have made a foundation for their care and education.

What a condition this reveals. Will anyone wonder that Gladstone said only a short time before he passed away, "Divorce constitutes the greatest menace to American institutions."

Time will not permit an exhaustive discussion of the entire problem of marriage and divorce, but with the ballot in the hands of the women of this country they will take some short-cuts to the solution of the problem of this national disgrace, and the first chapter in that short-cut will be the adoption of a "Twentieth Amendment" to the Federal Constitution permitting the enactment of a Federal law of marriage and divorce. We must deal with this question through Federal legislation, because if every state in the Union but one were to pass uniform marriage and divorce laws, the remaining state would still furnish the nation with a divorce mecca.

Honorable marriage between the fit should be encouraged, and if divorce must be granted, as we think it sometimes must, that divorce should be valid in all the states of the Union, and children who are legitimate in one state should be legitimate in every other state.

But I cannot discuss every separate phase of the enfranchisement of the women of America. I confess to a spirit of pessimism when I study the machinery of the government for correcting the evils that in these days of speedy evolution in industrial affairs necessitate laws for the protection of the people from extortion.

I have spoken of some of the very fundamental causes of divorce, but I have not spoken of the one greatest underlying cause of the domestic troubles that are today bringing sorrow into the land.

When I see every day the young wives of our cities standing behind the counters in the marts of trade, or filling places as stenographers in some man's office, instead of doing the daily duties of a loving wife and mother in a real American home, I am alarmed for the safety of the nation and the sanctity and peace of the American home. I am not passing a rash or harsh judgment upon the woman whose married life has brought to her the apparent necessity of taking her place in such an environment as one of the breadwinners, but I know the dangers that lurk around such an environment, and I think I know that this is not God's way of life and this is enough.

An economic condition that offers an argument for such an employment for young wives is vicious, and this nation will not see the per cent of divorces lowered until the argument of human need has been answered by righteous laws that will make it possible for every young wife to take her place in the world where God intended she should labor as the queen of a happy home, where her mother heart might satisfy its longings in the love and care of a family of her own blood.

Women of America! We need your influence in the making of laws that relate to the home and the home life of our country.

We need your councils in the larger problems of the world. You can render the nation no service by joining hands with political parties. This course would simply add to the already unwieldy mass of political unrest that keeps the nation divided upon the vital questions

that so much need the wise judgment of students instead of prejudiced politicians. Outside of political parties the women of the nation will be a mobile mass, poised to crush the enemies of the world as they show their heads in election contests and at the polls.

But we must not proscribe the limits of women's work as citizens by limiting her sphere of public action to the questions that relate alone to the moral and social conditions of society? To do this would not only insult the splendid spirit of the women of this generation in their work for the public good, but it would render an untrue verdict of the public opinion as to woman's place as man's equal in every test of masterly achievement. Women have taken an honorable place in art, we have felt their magic power in literature, their place in science and in business has been assured, and they have more than stood the test as they have stood by us in the field of education. In every field of human endeavor they have stood the supreme test of equality, except in the physical conquests of war, and here their power at the ballot box will wield an influence that will surely destroy the possibility that the world will ever again be disgraced by war.

Under the christian democracy we propose, the women of this nation will immediately become active members of the greatest school of problem solving that has ever been made possible in any land or in any generation. They will take their place as teachers. They will force upon the student life of America, a study of the fundamental problems of government, instead of being forced, as they are today by political prejudice, to stand aloof even from a mention of anything that might seem political. In their homes they will study the great problems of government, and in the community meetings they will

exchange their conclusions with their neighbors, and out of the multitude of their councils their verdict will seldom fall short of justice.

What is the possibility of such a force as this in the world? More than fifty per cent of the voting strength of the nation is in the hands of the women. They have been freer than the men from the environments of political prejudice. Theirs will be the judgments of unprejudiced jurors. Their sympathies will ever be in favor of the weaker members of society rather than the more powerful. Their vision for the uplift of the world cannot but be helpful in solving the problems of society. It is true that the home will be their special interest, but do they not understand that happy homes cannot be built in an environment of legalized poverty? The women of this nation know as well as any class of society that the fetters that have bound the hands of the labor of this nation in an industrial slavery, and the conditions under which such an industrial slavery has been made possible in this christian nation must be removed. They know, too, that in order to accomplish these things the first thing that must be done, and that thing is imperative, is to make the government easily responsive to the people.

Under a responsive government the problems will be studied by the men and women who will render their verdict at the ballot box, and when this is made possible, no man need fear what the verdict will be, for under such a government the men who seek special privilege can have no chance to avoid the light of public education before the verdict is rendered at the polls.

Can any man have a just conception of what this world would be under such a government as we propose? Sixty per cent of the homes of this nation are at

this time occupied by tenants. If this nation can hope to live, tenancy must give way to ownership. At this moment the stored energy of the nation drawing interest reaches far above a hundred billion dollars. No free people can long withstand this awful handicap. More than ninety per cent of the wealth that the labor of the nation has brought into existence is owned by two per cent of the people. No nation can long endure under such a handicap of poverty as this reveals.

The over-riches that is revealed by our ledger was made possible by legislation that gave special privileges, and the great fortunes that have been amassed under those laws must be returned to the people who produced them, not by any process of confiscation, not by force, but by peaceful methods of legal enactment.

Mothers of America! You have been granted the power of the ballot just in time to save the nation. Your mother heart will respond to such a call for help as this will be, for the application of the remedies will mean that the American government will be wrested from the monopolies, and trusts, and from pie-counter politicians and restored to the people, and American home life will make possible the realization of that Life, Liberty and Happiness that was the promise of the fathers of the Republic.

Chapter XIV

WHEN A NATION SPEAKS

Have the people of this generation sensed the spirit of the Revolutionary fathers as they fought the battles against the powers of autocracy that were trying to crush from this land the spirit of freedom and religious liberty?

Have they lost that vision of a new world that so inspired the fathers of the republic and promised to them the end of kings and royalty and autocracy and injustice?

Have they forgotten that doctrine of human rights that was written into the ethics of this new world when Thomas Jefferson said, "All men are created equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights. Among these are the right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness?"

Has this generation stopped in its wild chase after the almighty dollar to ask, "What is Life?" and "What is Liberty?" and "What is Happiness?"

The power of the mind of man has been the wonder of every age, but have we forgotten that the mind is just as certainly the power of the nation as the mind of a man is the power behind the man?

The mind of a nation, and when a nation speaks! Who can grasp the meaning of those words?

The early philosophy of all the past ages was embodied in the practical solution of the problems of government as they were expressed in the work of our forefathers in our constitution, but not yet has come to the world the real meaning of a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The work of this generation is to reincarnate the spirit of the Revolutionary fathers, and to restore to the people in that spirit whatever has been lost in the evolution of the government that represents the world's commercial and industrial changes.

We must get back to first principles. We must lay some new foundations. We must make our government responsive to the people. We must so change the machinery for making laws as to make it easy for the people to speak their mind upon great questions. We must guard well every demand for new laws, lest those demands shall come from people who seek special privilege, instead of from people who seek the welfare of all.

No period of the world's history has witnessed such advancement in civilization and in wealth as the era of progress through which we have just passed. God has unlocked the storehouses of His eternal power and let the children of men possess more of His hidden mysteries than has ever been entrusted to them since the beginning of the world. Messages go round the world today with the fleetness of thought. We have gathered the electric waves and attuned them to sensitive instruments with which we read the thoughts of man across waters and the land alike. By the unlocking of that storehouse of hidden secrets, man has come to know God's wonderful powers, and his mind has harnessed those powers of nature and applied them to his comfort and happiness.

Did God withhold these secrets from man for so many years because He knew that man would apply them to selfish purposes, instead of applying them to the bringing of happiness for all men alike? Have we applied the powers so entrusted to us for the good of all the people? Our civilization must answer this question, and

if that answer shall be that selfishness has applied to individual gain the powers that God so long withheld, I fear that He will come in His wrath and destroy what we have built, and then demand that we return the talents He has given us. God gave man dominion over all the earth. Through all the ages that have passed the power of God has been present in every hidden wave of electricity and in steam and in mechanical power, but through all those ages until recently man has never recognized them as his friend.

Have we come to think that because so much has been given to this generation, the inner chamber of God's storehouse of hidden mysteries has been unlocked? Let us not deceive ourselves. The world is on trial. The good things we enjoy today are only a test of our willingness to use aright those already given. In the inner chamber of God's storehouse of eternal truth are hidden secrets that as far transcend the revelations to this generation of men as the beauties of heaven transcend the beauties of earth. Man has never understood that first written will in which God gave to Adam, and through him to all the world, the inheritance of his wonderful creation.

Since that great civil struggle in which we purged ourselves of chattel slavery we have enjoyed the greatest era of prosperity that has ever been enjoyed by any country in any age; but with all the prosperity, and with all the wealth and power, and with all the labor-saving inventions that have been brought to man, we are living in a period of unrest and discontent. With the old civilization we have buried the rules by which that civilization was applied.

We have boasted how sacredly our constitution guards the rights of property, but we have forgotten that the

right to life and the right to live and labor for the bread of life are far superior to any right that property should have enjoyed.

It sounds well to boast of the protection of property, but is it not about time this great government thought something of the rights of its weaker citizens?

This is a nation of freemen. They are proud of the thrift of the people. They are industrious, but they believe in honest industry. They never dreamed in the early days that the peaceful conquest of the nation was being effected through interest-privilege seekers. The wealth of this nation was created by honest toil, and whether it represents the last meal in the home of the honest toiler or the watered stock in a great corporation, it was earned by the toil of the same men. The rich men of our country hold it today by right of the law, but is there not a higher law by which the final judgments of the world are made? God said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

The stored energy of this nation, with its interest tributes in one form or another, is sapping the very life of this republic. It is demanding its pound of flesh as the sun sets upon the day's toil, and every day the demand will be harder for the people to meet. Their burdens are now heavier than they can bear. On the farms and in the factories they produce the wealth that fills our storehouses every year, but they have no right to say who shall go to those storehouses and receive the things that the labor of the nation has produced.

If it is a fact that the labor of this nation is sweating in its workhouses and on its farms to support a hoard of idlers who neither work nor hold in good esteem those who do, it is time such a condition shall end. Did Holy Writ misstate the doctrines of the Lord when it

said, "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat?" Pitiful poverty and over-riches will no more thrive on the free soil of America than master and slave. But when I speak of poverty, I do not mean the poverty that is the result of indolence, but the poverty that we know as the finished product of exploitation. Were some men born to serve, while other men were born to be served? Is this land of the free destined to become a land of serfs? Must it be said that a people born to a heritage of freedom and liberty will be enslaved without a protest or a murmur? Must the great industries of this nation stand before the coming generations as a monument to the dead heroes of toil who went to untimely graves while they were building them? Do the people who live in the city of toil owe to their masters that wealth be piled up at the price of blood? Fellow Countrymen! If these things be true, we do not wonder at the stinging words of Rudyard Kipling when he said in his poem, "The City of Toil,"

"We have fed you all for a thousand years, and you hail
us still unfed,
Though there's never a dollar of all your wealth but
marks the workers dead;
We have yielded our best to give you rest, and you lie
on crimson wool,
For if blood be the price of all your wealth, good God
we ha' paid it in full.

"There's never a mine blown skyward now, but we're
buried alive with you,
There's never a wreck drifts shoreward now but we're
the ghastly crew,
Go, reckon the dead by the forges red, and the factories
where you spin,

If blood be the price of your accursed wealth, good
God, we ha' paid it in.

We have fed you all for a thousand years, for that was
our doom you know,
From the days when you chained us in your fields, to
the strike of a week ago;
You have eaten our lives, our babes and our wives, and
we're told its your legal share,
But if blood is the price of your lawful wealth, good
God, we ha' bought it fair."

We have called attention in another chapter to the awful burden of debt that somehow has been heaped upon the American people. Insiduously these debts have increased until at this time the problem is not, "How can the debts be paid," but "Can they ever be paid?" The farms are mortgaged. School districts are bonded to the legal limit. Cities are hopelessly in debt. Counties are in the clutches of obligations for future payments. States are laboring under the same handicap. Business from the corner grocery to the largest concerns is being done on credit. Individual credit is strained to the limit. Banks are failing everywhere. Debt and credit are so firmly written into the business of the world that by the commercial blue books of every community every man's ability to pay debts is measured by the standard of the dollar.

Is anyone able to explain just how this awful burden of debt has been fastened upon the American people? Will any thoughtful man subscribe to the theory that the nation's obligations for future payment represent the natural economic evolution of commercial transactions?

America is today paying more than seven billion dol-

lars of interest. This includes the government, municipal and bonded debts as well as the debts of every character. The government's annual budget reaches above five billion dollars. The tax-free bonds of the government amount to more than eighteen billion dollars, while the tax-free mortgages amount to more than twenty-seven billion dollars. The tax-free municipal securities amount to more than four billion dollars and under the federal loan system bonds already issued amount to an enormous sum. Then to add to all these burdens the people are annually paying the premium on life insurance policies amounting to forty-five billion dollars. These are only a part of the obligations of the nation that annually demand interest tribute in one form or another, and the most serious part of the problem is found in the fact that a very large part of these vast accumultions of this wealth, being invested in tax-free securities, is thereby exempted from the payment of tax that would otherwise be assessed against those who would be obliged to pay an income tax. We noted in another chapter that real estate tax-free mortgages have been a very favored investment, but just how favored they have been will be better understood when their effect on the income taxes of a rich man is considered. To a man having an income of five hundred thousand dollars a four per cent tax-free bond is as desirable as a taxable bond drawing 13.79 per cent. The larger the income the more valuable the investment to the rich who, by side-stepping, might avoid their income tax.

In this connection we might also call attention to the desirability of government bonds as a favored investment, since the effect would doubtless be the same with these as with the tax-free real estate mortgages.

If anyone has doubt about these bonds being favored

as an investment by the rich, and the very rich, they might have had a more concrete example of their value as a preferred investment at the time when there were millions of dollars of these bonds on the market at eighty-five cents on the dollar.

Let no man be misled into the belief that the interest we must pay on these tax-free mortgages is not a demand upon the labor of this nation just the same as though it was a taxable obligation. Every dollar of that great sum of human energy that must be paid as interest is a tax upon the products of the labor of this nation.

This nation's burdens are already heavier than it can bear. If the backs of this generation cannot bear the burden, then there is only one alternative, and that alternative is to unload upon the backs of your children and your children's children the awful burden that you should have borne.

It will not do to delay the settlement of this nation's problem of debt to another generation. The debts are every year increasing. Big business and these interest accumulations every year are converting these accumulations into the products of toil and converting those products into more money to loan to the people. In only a few years the interest alone will double the debts, and then in a few more years they will triple them, and then what?

Our beloved Lincoln, speaking at the close of the civil war, said, "This struggle has had only to do with slave labor, but behind this is an impending crisis of which in my present position I could not be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of despotism. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with labor in the structure of government," and in the same appeal he said, "Beware of surrendering a

political power which you already possess, and which if surrendered will surely close the doors of advancement against you and fix new disabilities and burdens, until all of liberty will be lost."

These words after fifty years of exploitation by the capitalistic classes, seem like a prophecy direct from Heaven. Has the prophecy been fulfilled? My Countrymen! As I study the problems of these times; as I read in the great ledger balances of the nation our record of debt; as I feel the iron hand of the power of money in the making of laws of the nation; as I ponder over the power of hoarded millions to hoard more, and to dictate to labor and to law makers alike; as I view their palaces of luxury on the hill and the tenements of toil in the valley; as I study the power of money to gather income without effort, and then compare it with the power of man to gather income by the sweat of honest toil, I can only think that the prophecy of that great man has been fulfilled.

You will agree with me that the prophecy has been fulfilled, and you will agree with me when I say that the government of this nation must be restored to the people from whom it has so ruthlessly been wrested. The restoration of this government to the people will be the greatest struggle that has ever been staged in this nation and in the world since the beginning of organized government. In that struggle a united people must go forward in a devout spirit of Christian fellowship and write into the laws of this land, and into the hearts of its people, the remedies that must be applied, and then with the vigor of christian soldiers we must see that the laws so enacted are administered in the fear of God.

Our New Nationalism

Have the people of this great government come to realize how slow we are to reject the old teachers and accept the new things that have come to us as the result of years of education and experience? Do the people realize just how deep-seated are the prejudices of our early teachings? Do we understand in America how hard it has ever been to turn our backs upon the teachings of bygone days, and our faces to the front where we can look into a great future? Someone has said that "history is philosophy teaching by example." If this is true, then we must remember that the history of the past may furnish a guide to a better future by pointing out the errors of the past.

The last half century of industrial strife in America, and the great conflict out of which the world is just emerging, have brought America face to face with two of the greatest problems that have ever gripped the world. These problems are demanding solution, not in America alone, but in the entire civilized world. These are the problems of our New Nationalism and the problems of our international relations. To these complex questions we must give a candid and thoughtful consideration, because their solution is sure to pave the way either to a great future or to a national disaster.

The individualism of half a century ago has given place to the power of organization that is the dominant force in America in this generation. Organized capital controls the industries of the nation at this time. It owns our mines, our railroads, our factories, and every means of distribution. The corporations of two decades ago have become the giant trusts of this generation. Their power is the most alarming symptom of impending disaster in America at this time. The vision of the

modern trust is a vision of power. The old theory of a distinct individualism has been swallowed up in the modern trust, and the spirit of money making in the trust has gone mad.

The people of the nation understand the power of the trust to fix prices, and its power to exploit the labor of the nation is not disputed in any field of action. It is true that the trusts own the machines, but it is also true that it takes men and women to run the machines, and the industry that forgets the men and women who do the manual labor to run those machines must, the moment it forgets, face certain ruin.

Tenancy and usury are the blight of the American home. They furnish an unhealthful atmosphere in which to develop a strong national life. We must paint a new picture of America. It must show every landscape dotted over with happy homes. Permanency must be written in every structure, and happiness and contentment must be reflected in every dooryard. Organized wealth must get a new vision of the rights of men, and machines, and money, and organized capital and organized labor must be bound together in a contract of friendly co-operation. Such a friendly co-operation will bring contentment where discontent reigned, plenty where there was abject poverty, and happiness where there was nothing but anxiety and sorrow.

The great war brought to the world a new vision of international rights, and it proclaimed for the first time in all history the rights of small and large nations alike. That vision was written into the terms of the armistice, and it was later written into the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. When that immortal document was presented to our senate for ratification the people came to know for the first time that militarism is an industry.

It was then that they learned that wars are the birthright of militarism and that battlefields are their harvests. This will answer in a measure at least why our senate refused to ratify the Versailles treaty.

The war, the League of Nations and its world court, have written into world thought a new internationalism that takes account of the rights of the weakest nations of earth, and the world has come to know that in our twentieth century civilization no nation can live alone.

Let no man be deceived. Ours is a wonderful nation, and its cleavage in world affairs cannot be minimized, but on the eve of the disarmament conference it is in so critical a position that it can build for a great and permanent future, or lay the foundation for a national disaster at home.

This great nation wants peace. It believes that disarmament must precede peace, but it knows that partial disarmament can never settle the question of world peace, for as long as battleships plough the great oceans of the world, the peace of the world will be in danger.

From every fireside of America a fervent hope and prayer went up to heaven for the ratification of the Versailles treaty, and now that its doom has been written into the history of this nation we will again hope and pray that some arrangement may be effected that will insure an enduring world peace. Will the hope be realized? Will our prayers be answered? These questions are on the lip or in the heart of every true American. Is world peace not possible of achievement? Is the christianity of the world still impotent? We have proudly boasted that this is a christian nation. These are times for self-examination. Are we christian? Is our government christian? Is the spirit of individualism that has built in America the greatest trust system

that ever disgraced the world, christian? Is the industrial war that has so long been going on between capital and labor christian? Do the tenements in the valley and the mansions of their masters on the hill tell a story of the application of the spirit Christ taught? Is the story of the unconscionable profiteering through which we are just passing such a story as to inspire us to believe that this is indeed a christian nation. May it truthfully be said that we are a christian nation while it is possible and a fact that ninety-six men in our country own property drawing incomes amounting to from $750,000 to $1,000,000 each, annually? Can we think that in this Christian land of plenty, in this land of opportunity, sixty per cent of the farms of the nation are being tilled by tenants?

This is not a christian nation. It is a nation of ungodly, and unconscienciable selfishness. The problem of over-riches and the problem of debt are the two master problems of humanity. Who is wise enough to bring the solution of these problems to the world?

We have pointed out in our weakness what militarism and war must mean to the world. We have tried to impress this nation with the dangers that are lurking in un-Americanized foreigners that are today congregated in the great commercial centers of the nation. We have told the people of the deadly menace of over-riches that at this time has changed our once happy homes of ownership into an un-American condition of tenancy. We have pointed out the futility of depending upon our system of "government by party" to right the wrongs of the nation; we have called attention to the power of organization, and we have tried to make clear that if this nation may hope to realize the ideals of the fathers of the republic, there is only one sure

road, and that road leads into the organization of the forces of the christians of America, the newly enfranchised women, and that great army of men and women who must labor from year end to year end for their daily bread into an army of righteousness, determined to build upon the ruins of "government by party" the greatest christian democracy that has ever blessed the world.

What an army for reform this would be. Powerful enough in numbers, and in christian spirit, to move this great republic into any program of righteousness without delay.

Let no man misunderstand our hopes and aspirations for the immediate power of such an organization. We are a nation of many minds and of many and diversified interests. The politicians will be against us from the beginning. The "pie counter" will warp their judgment. The organized exploiters of labor will howl their disapproval. The spirit of militarism in this nation, that thrives only by planting discontent that it may reap a harvest of war, will raise its voice in protest, for the spirit of militarism is not yet dead. It will be a peaceful revolution in which the doctrines of the "Christ applied to government" will be pitted against the uncurbed powers of selfishness and greed in the world, and that revolution will never end until the wrongs that afflict humanity shall be righted. If a christian democracy cannot bring the answer of a christian government to this nation, then we must look for other solutions to the problems that confront us. If the christianity of this nation will not use its great power and its great army of christian voters to aid in this peaceful revolution, then the world has failed and christianity can have no message for a lost world.

Is this not the doctrine that Christ taught when He was here among men? His religion was so simple that even His own disciples did not understand it. He said, "I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me, sick and ye visited me, in prison and ye came unto me." When His disciples heard these things they were amazed, and they said, "Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered and gave Thee meat, or a stranger and took Thee in, or naked and clothed Thee, or when saw we Thee sick and in prison and came unto Thee?" The Lord said, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." This is the religion of human need, satisfied by human sympathy. It is the answer of the brotherhood of man applied to human need. Can it be applied in our generation? It can be applied, and its application is the greatest challenge that has ever come to the christian people of America. It is the doctrine of human need answered through the application of human law.

Men and women of America! It is a proud boast that ours is a christian nation. In a sense that proud boast has been realized, but in a broader and a more vital sense it has never been true. The great war brought to the world a vision of a new internationalism, and to this nation a new vision of nationalism, and it must bring to the christian people of this nation and to the christian churches a new and a broader vision of the meaning of Christianity. If this is a christian nation it must get a vision of a christian state and a christian nation. The day of individualism in christianity is past. The churches must get the vision of a christianized state and nation, and a christianized state and na-

tion can mean nothing less than that the state and nation must be christianized by law.

The early teachings of the fathers that the doctrines of a separation of church and state were indispensable to a stable government and the influence of the church may have been right in that generation, but the churches of this nation might as well try to dam the waters of Niagara River with shovels as to curb the unrighteous selfishness of this commercial generation unless they can impress the doctrines of the Christ in law. If we christianize government, we must christianize law. If we christianize law, we must do it at the ballot box. The ballot box exerts no influence except through majorities. Majorities are simply the expression of the public mind. The public mind is a creature of education.

When a Nation Speaks. This is a wonderful vision, but is it broad enough? Shall we change it to say, "When a Christian Nation Speaks?" If America is indeed a christian nation, then it will not so much matter, but are the christian churches ready to unite as one man in a program of reform that is to mean so much to the future of the world as the program we have outlined? It will little matter whether they endorse and approve every sentiment we have expressed unless they are willing to carry their endorsement to the polls and give expression of their approval in the ballot box.

We have plead for the vision of a Christian Democracy in this nation, because a Christian democracy must mean that the great army of christian men and women of the land under a christian democracy will furnish the greatest school for problem solving that has ever been organized on earth. It will not only furnish the means of education, but it will furnish the machinery through which the nation can speak its mind upon the great problems of the government.

When a nation speaks under a christian democracy the over-riches of a few men will never again be permitted to shame this land by the blight of tenancy instead of making it blossom with happy homes. Human want in the midst of plenty will be a thing unknown. Unemployment and its consequent poverty will never again disgrace our civilization.

Churches of America! Women of our great country! Men and women who belong to that great army who are doing the labor of the world, the power in the political and social revolution which we propose is in your hands as long as you have the ballot. Could I paint a picture of the world after the political war that has been in progress for a hundred years has been closed and after an armistice has been signed and sealed in which this nation has purged itself of that ulcer of political prejudice that has so long stood in the way of material progress, I would be able with such a picture to show my readers more in a moment of time than my poor words can bring to them through great effort. The challenge of the world today is men and women who have a vision of righteousness and the bravery and wisdom to assume leadership in this great struggle for a new world in which the right of every human being shall be the supreme issue and be fought to a righteous conclusion. Shall we hope to get the men and women? Is America willing to be the grave in which the hopes of the world shall be entombed? Shall we forget our immortal trust? O America, yours was a great opportunity, and a great responsibility. You have had a glorious past, but your future is ahead. Today is ours, but the tomorrow of the world belongs to our children. What shall that tomorrow be?

God is calling today for men and women to stand guard on the watch-towers of American Liberty as He never called before. Will He find the men and women?

The End.

SUBJECT INDEX

Chapter I—Introduction	Page
Creation—In the beginning, God	1
God's penalty for the first sin	2
Eden. "Am I my brother's keeper?"	4
A babe was born in Bethlehem	4
Religious Liberty—the first principle of a real civilization	5
"All men are created equal"	7
Thoughtless America, you are basking in the sunshine of youth	9
Chapter II—What Is Life?	12
Jefferson's conception of life	13
A rich man's conception of life	14
A woman's conception of life	14
A noted clergyman's conception of life	16
A sociologist's conception of life	16
Do we enjoy the protection promised by our constitution?	17
Chapter III—The Blight of War	20
If our writers could dramatize the peaceful struggles, etc.	20
War's awful cost	21
Poison gases in the next war	22
There is a remedy	22
Dr. Rosa on the cost of war	23
Painter, paint a picture	24
We have built up a militarism	25
Disarmament—the symbol of a new hope	25
Appropriations for war and agriculture	26
Our pension bills for past wars	26
Our military aristocracy	27
Militarism must be destroyed	27
An American boy's life is worth just $47	28
Industrial isolation	30
America's greatness	30
World peace was the ideal of our boys	31

Page
Who was responsible for the defeat of the Versailles treaty? 31
The defeat of the Versailles treaty was an insult to our boys 32
The League of Nations was our child 33
What it cost to defeat the League 33
A mother speaks 34

Chapter IV—A World Peace 37
"To you from failing hands we throw the torch" 39
Three months of the League of Nations 40
Leon Bourgeois (address) 41
Lord Curzon, for the British Empire 41
The empty chair 41
"Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting 42
America has not yet spoken upon war 43

Chapter V—The Nation's Dance of Death 45
Legislatures have run wild 48
The problems of revenue 48
Table of rural assessment, 1920 51
Table of urban assessment, 1920 52
Tax-free mortgages 55
The loan shark law 57
The assessment of credits 58
Assessment of money in banks 60
Assessment of merchandise 61
Assessment of book accounts 62
Assessment of stocks of corporations 63
Public service corporations 64
A righteous revenue law the remedy 69
A belated testimony 73
Money has never been assessed 74
Assessment of merchandise 74
Assessment of corporations 74
Constitutional provisions 75
Tangible and intangible property 76
Premeditated exemption of property 76
We need more money, not more tax-drones and tax-dodgers 77
A crime against the taxpayers 77

page
Chapter VI—Government by Party 78
Washington on the danger of the party spirit 78
Are political parties necessary? 80
Partisanship and the slavery question 81
Partisanship and prohibition 82
Partisanship and suffrage 83
The party label 86
Why a legislature? 86
Law-making is creative 88
Why two houses of a legislative body? 90
A national referendum 97
A presidential primary 97
Initiative and recall 98

Chapter VII—Competition 101
The evolution of economics 101
Competition means that the strong win 103
The origin of competition 105
Honest competition 106
The trusts, their policies and powers 112
The law of "The survival of the fittest" 113
Lloyd George and a minimum wage 114
Standardization is the remedy 116

Chapter VIII—Arbitration 117
Men ask, "Is it lawful?" not "Is it right?" 117
Courts are being used as a means of exploitation 127
The court's duty 127
The lawyer's ethics 128
Compulsory arbitration 133

Chapter IX—Industrial Peace 137
When industry began 137
Labor and the machine 140
Our power of production with machines 142
The basic principle of industry is labor 143
Two great problems—price and value 146
Value as it relates to land and wheat 146
"The dollar of our daddies" 148
Interest 149
The Federal Reserve Banks 149
Where has all the money gone? 149

Page
The price of industrial peace....153
A living wage....153
The old Roman law of ownership....155
Labor's new obligation....156
The problem of the grain gambler....157
The danger of a food shortage....159
Our national unit of super-dominance....159
Standardization of wheat and cotton....159

Chapter X—The Peril of American Cities....163
Increase of foreign population....164
The political power of our cities....165
All roads lead to New York....166
The balance of power....167
Group political action....168
America for Americans....169
Home rule and the "wide open" city....170
Theodore Roosevelt on the menace of our American cities....172
Americanization....174
Americanized foreigners....175
Foreigners, this is your adopted country....176
Cities of America. You must beware....177

Chapter XI—The problem of over-riches....178
The race of life....179
The handicap of poverty....179
John Stuart Mills on property....181
John Stuart Mills on inheritance....182
Blackmore and Bancroft on inheritance tax....183
The right of inheritance....184
The Supreme Court of the United States on the right to limit inheritance....184
Has a man a right to bequeath money he never earned?..185
The income tax and the nation's ledger....188
The conquest of America....189
Interest gathering securities and unemployment....190
A National fixed inheritance....192
A protection to minor heirs....196
Restitution or ruin, which?....197

Page
Chapter XII—To the Christian Churches of America....199
A personal religion....200
The conquest of the great West....201
John Ruskin's model church....203
The greatest revolution....204
The church must be aroused....205
The Inter-Church world movement....206
The churches must unite....208
The power of the churches, 43,000,000 souls....210
The challenge of the age....210

Chapter XIII—To the Newly Enfranchised Women of America....212
The legalized saloon....213
Woman's outlook upon life....214
What will the women do?....214
The American home....215
Is marriage a civil contract?....215
Where parents fail....217
A single standard of purity....217
God's plan of life....218
The first cause of divorce....219
Divorce....222
Gladstone on "American divorces"....223
The twentieth amendment....223
Women bread-winners....224
Woman's place in the world....225
Women in the problem-solving campaigns of a Christian democracy....225

Chapter XIV—When a Nation Speaks....228
The interest-burden of the people....231
The City of Toil (Kipling)....232
Our new nationalism and internationalism....237
Is this nation Christian?....239
Let no man misunderstand our hopes and aspirations....241
"I was an hungered and Ye gave me meat"....242
We must get a vision of a christianized state and nation....243
When a nation speaks....243
God is calling for men and women....245

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 027 273 530 A